

THE HEBREW PERIODICAL HA-SHILOAH  
FROM 1896 TO 1919 AND ITS ROLE  
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN HEBREW LITERATURE

by

Ali Mohamed Abd El-Rahman Attia

A thesis submitted in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy in Modern Hebrew  
Literature

School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of London  
1979



ProQuest Number: 10731353

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731353

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

THE HEBREW PERIODICAL HA-SHILOAH  
 FROM 1896 TO 1919 AND ITS ROLE  
 IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN HEBREW LITERATURE

by

Ali Mohamed Abd El-Rahman Attia

ABSTRACT

The Hebrew monthly Ha-Shiloah is one of a very few periodicals which made a great impact on the development of modern Hebrew literature. In order to establish the importance of this periodical, Chapter I of this thesis is devoted to a discussion of the knowledge of Hebrew among the reading public and the various methods of Jewish education. This is followed by a historical survey of Hebrew periodicals in Germany, Austria, Russia and Poland before the publication of Ha-Shiloah.

Chapter II is devoted to the period in which Ha-Shiloah was edited by Ahad Ha-Cam. It includes his efforts to establish the paper, his editorial policy and the argument of the 'Young Writers' against it. A discussion is also included of some literary and administrative problems that came from his editorial treatment of contributions to the periodical and his determination to maintain a high literary standard. The last section of this chapter is a literary survey of the material that appeared in Ha-Shiloah during this period.

Chapter III treats the rest of the European period before the paper was moved to Palestine. It discusses the change of editors and the consequent change in policy. The role of Klausner and Bialik in editing the journal, and the influence of Ahad Ha-Cam on both are surveyed in detail. The chapter also includes a discussion of the link between Ha-Shiloah and Ha-Sofeh and the effect of this link on the publication of Ha-Shiloah. Other problems which faced the publication of Ha-Shiloah are fully analyzed. The last section is a literary assessment of material that appeared in the journal during this period.

Chapter IV is a summary survey of argument presented in the preceding chapters.

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
CONTENTS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
SCHEME OF TRANSLITERATION	v
PREFACE	vi
CHAPTER I.	
1. HEBREW AS A LITERARY MEDIUM IN RUSSIA AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY	1
2. HEBREW PERIODICALS BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF <u>HA-SHILOAH</u>	18
CHAPTER II. <u>HA-SHILOAH</u> IN THE FIRST PERIOD (1896-1902)	51
1. THE FOUNDATION OF <u>HA-SHILOAH</u>	51
2. EDITORIAL POLICY	64
3. THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN AHAD HA-CAM AND THE 'YOUNG WRITERS'	78
4. FINANCIAL MATTERS AND PROBLEMS OF PUBLICATION	92
5. FEATURES OF AHAD HA-CAM'S EDITORIAL ACTIVITY	105
6. A LITERARY SURVEY OF <u>HA-SHILOAH</u> DURING THE FIRST PERIOD	126
CHAPTER III. <u>HA-SHILOAH</u> IN THE SECOND PERIOD (1903-1919)	166
1. THE APPOINTMENT AND POLICY OF KLAUSNER	166
2. KLAUSNER AS CONTRIBUTOR AND EDITOR	179
3. BIALIK AS CONTRIBUTOR AND EDITOR	211
4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS	230
5. A LITERARY SURVEY OF <u>HA-SHILOAH</u> DURING THE SECOND PERIOD	245
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS	265
EXCURSUS (A): <u>HA-SHAHAR AND HA-SHILOAH : SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES</u>	279
EXCURSUS (B): THE STYLE OF AHAD HA-CAM	287
APPENDIX I	297
APPENDIX II	304
APPENDIX III	317
BIBLIOGRAPHY: (a) English	318
(b) Hebrew	319



### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to those who have helped make this study possible. My greatest debt<sup>is</sup> to Professor J.B. Segal for his stimulating instruction and for his expert guidance. I should also wish to thank Dr. M. Nadav, Head of the Department of Manuscripts and Archives, The Jewish National and University Library of Jerusalem for making available to me some of the unpublished material in the archives of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and Klausner.

My thanks go also to Dr. G. Mandel of the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, to Mr. G. Kressel, Mr. S.C. Devani of the Inter-library-Loan (at S.O.A.S.), and to Mr. P.S. Salinger, Assistant Librarian (Near and Middle East) for their invaluable help in providing the required material.

Not least, I am grateful to my wife Badia for her encouragement and moral support.

Finally, thanks to Mrs. Sylvia Greenwood, my efficient typist.

## SCHEME OF TRANSLITERATION

Consonants		Vowels	
k	'		a
ɓ	b		a
ɗ	v		o
ɗ, ɗ	g		u
ɗ, ɗ	d		i
h	h		e
ɰ	w		é
ɰ	z		e
h	h		e
ɗ	t		e
ɰ	y		o
ɗ	k		e
ɗ	kh		
ɰ	l		
ɗ	m		
ɰ	n		
ɗ	s		
ɰ	c		
ɗ	p		
ɗ	f		
ɰ	s		
ɰ	q		
ɰ	r		
ɰ	sh		
ɰ	ś		
ɰ, ɰ	t		

The transliteration of personal and conventional names follows that of the Encyclopaedia Judaica.

## PREFACE

The subject of this study is the most important phase, the first twenty-three years, of Ha-Shiloah's publication in Europe, under the editorship of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and Klausner.

This study offers a detailed survey of a journal whose significance for the development of modern Hebrew literature has long been recognised. But it is difficult to analyze and present the journal in any kind of coherent and unified study. Certain basic interests and a definite ideological framework stand out distinctly throughout almost the entire range of subjects treated in the journal, making it impossible to survey and assess these views within the reasonable limitation offered by a single study. It is impossible to do full justice within this restricted space to all the important features of a monthly which covered nearly all fields of literature.

For this reason too, it seemed appropriate to confine the study of the historical background, before the publication of Ha-Shiloah, to the important Hebrew periodicals - although, it is true, non-Hebrew periodicals affected the success of the monthly in an indirect way.

The emphasis in this study is inevitably laid on the period in which the journal was under the editorship of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am . This was the period in which was laid

down the policy of the paper, and its reputation as a highly respected monthly was built up. Another reason for this emphasis on that period was the availability of material. The main source of information for this study was the correspondence between the editors and both their contributors and publishers. In this respect, Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's published letters, although dealing only with literary matters, were of great value. This source of information is unfortunately lacking in the period of Klausner, since he was not in the habit of keeping copies of his own letters or of those dealing with matters relating to Ha-Shiloah that were sent to him by others. However, I was fortunate enough to have access to some unpublished material from the archives of both Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am (classified as Hebrew Archives No: 40791) in The National and University Library, Jerusalem; and that of Klausner (classified as Hebrew Archives No: 401086) in The National and University Library, Jerusalem. Unfortunately I did not receive all the material for which I asked.

The archival material is referred to in the footnotes as: 'Arkhiyon A.H. (Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am) and 'Arkhiyon K. (Klausner) followed by a slash (/), followed by the number of the file and where possible, the date of the letter.

## CHAPTER I

### 1. HEBREW AS A LITERARY MEDIUM IN RUSSIA AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

In the year 1891, A.L. Shalkovich, known by his pseudonym Ben-Avigdor, commenced the publication of a series of stories, sketches and poems under the general name of "*Sifré Agorah*"; in these the emphasis was upon the more material, secular and universal aspects of life. To it contributed, apart from Ben-Avigdor himself, writers like R. Brainin, J. Gorin, I.H. Tawlow and N.N. Samuely. The enterprise was expanded two years later by the establishment of *Ahiasaf*, the first non-commercial Hebrew publishing company, in Warsaw, at the initiative of *Bené Mosheh* and under the direction of Ben-Avigdor and the guidance of *Ahad Ha-Cam*. This company which remained active until 1923, published work of modern Jewish scholarship; it was to play an important part in the development of Hebrew periodical literature.

Following a disagreement with his fellow-leaders of *Ahiasaf* over their attitude towards the widening of the scope of Hebrew literature, Ben-Avigdor set up the *Tushiyah* publishing company in 1895, and the new company extended its activity to Hebrew belles lettres, both original and translated. This company enriched Hebrew literature with the two series "*Bibliyoteqah C'ivrit*" and "*Bibliyoteqah gedolah*". They included some three hundred books on various aspects of belles lettres, history, science,

biography and reproductions of Hebrew works from previous periods as well as translations from other languages.

Six years later H.N. Bialik, S. Ben-Zion and I.H. Rawnitzki established the *Moriah* publishing company in Odessa for classical Hebrew literature and text-books for schools. It was succeeded by the *Dvir* publishing company set up in Berlin after the First World War by some of the founders of *Moriah*. The competition and rivalry between these publishing houses led to the publication of a large number of books in many fields of literature.

One would expect that such activity in the field of publication would help to create a new generation of Hebrew readers and stimulate their interest in Hebrew literature. Nevertheless, frequent complaints were heard about the low standard of Hebrew writers and the poor quality of their works, by some of the key figures of the Hebrew literary world. They wanted to achieve the standard of European literatures. Chief among them was Ahad Ha-Cam. He wrote in an article produced on the eleventh anniversary of *Ahiasaf*:

"By our public, books are considered now as nothing but a 'luxury', something not desperately required... There is not even a single writer in this period at whom we can say: this is the man for whom we were waiting! There has not been even a single writer upon whom we can look as one who has enriched our spiritual wealth with a notable and original idea which we did not know before, and which is not borrowed entirely from an alien literature. There is not a single branch of scientific or publicistic literature in which our writing has, lately, reached a certain degree of perfection to the extent of being on a par with alien literatures... The time has come for us to admit that our literature is not literature because our writers are not writers."(1)

---

(1) Kol Kitve A.H., p.328.

On another occasion he wrote:

"since the beginning of our modern literature it has not produced a really original book which can be described as revealing our national spirit in a special way. Almost all the works are either translations or imitations, for the most part imperfectly executed: the translations are too far from the original and the imitations are too close to the original."(2)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was not alone in being critical of the standard of Hebrew literature and its public. His views were shared by D. Frischmann although the latter differed in every sense of the word from Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. After a year of publication, the weekly Ha-Dor which was edited by Frischmann ceased to appear because of a lack of subscribers. In its last issue Frischmann wrote a very strong article against the reading public in which he argued:

"You did not believe me! I used to tell you every day that we have no people and no literature, we have no movement and no revival, we have nothing; but you did not want to believe me. I used to tell you every day that we have no writers and no subscribers, we have no book buyers and we have nothing - all that we have is empty phrases. The great movement about which you talk is no more than an artificial thing. But you were surprised and you attacked me and accused me of being over-pessimistic."(3)

Another writer equally different from Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was Brainin who discussed the problem in a very calm way, laying the emphasis on the lack of contact between writer and readers. He wrote:

---

(2) Ibid., p.180.

(3) Frischmann, D.: "Mikhtav Me'et ha-<sup>C</sup>orekh", Ha-Dor, 1901, No: 50, p.11.

"I and my fellow-writers have become in the last few years complete strangers to our readers. Has our generation - that of the revival of Hebrew literature - already gone and left us? Were our readers only of the past generation...? Is it likely that this revival, the revival of Hebrew literature and the Hebrew language, were no more than a morning dream, an evaporating dew, and a passing cloud? Or is perhaps our generation not yet born and our really intelligent readers also not yet born?"(4)

It is true that most of the blame for the alleged deterioration in the standard of Hebrew literature was laid on the readers. But the writers were equally responsible. They did not cope with the quick change and the rapid improvement in the standard and the taste of the majority of their readers to whom knowledge of Hebrew was only secondary. Some of these readers had no alternative but to desert Hebrew literature for Yiddish or the vernacular because of the failure of Hebrew writers to supply them with what they wanted. There is no doubt that financial, demographic and educational elements played an important role in this process. One could find some justification for the criticism, yet, at the same time, this period produced great names in various fields of Hebrew literature of writers who enriched it considerably, every one in his own branch and in his own style. Their works were and still are considered to be a guide for following generations. Some of those names are:

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, Ben-Avigdor, Bernfeld, Berdy<sup>C</sup>zewski, Bialik, Brainin, Brenner, Feuerberg, Frischmann, Kantor, Klausner,

---

(4) Brainin, R.: "Higyonot sofer<sup>C</sup>ivri", Ha-<sup>C</sup>Olam ii, 1909, No: 32, p.426.



Lewinsky, Mendele, Peretz, Tchernichowsky, Steinberg and many others.

Hebrew had its rivals among the reading public. The interest of Jews in East Europe, the main centre of European Jewry during the previous two centuries, was divided between three languages: Russian, Yiddish and Hebrew, particularly between the last two.

"In the last years of the 19th century only 1% of the Jews in the country declared that Russian was their mother-tongue; for 97% it was Yiddish. The same census in 1897 revealed that only 24.6% of the Jewish population could read and write in Russian."(5)

Despite all the efforts of the national movement to fight against the dominating influence of Yiddish by encouraging and financing the establishment of Hebrew schools, Hebrew speaking societies and Hebrew periodicals, nevertheless Yiddish remained the national language of most East European Jews. Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am referred to this in one of his letters:

"In order to give you an idea of the present state of Hebrew I shall tell you only what our colleagues at Ahiasaf have told me. They published two pamphlets on the Zionist Congress, one in Hebrew by Herzl himself and the other one in Jargon by Shalom Alekhem; the first was sold in 3000 copies only, while the other was sold in 27,000 copies."(6)

One of the contributors to Ha-Dor explained how wide was the gap between the percentage of Hebrew readers and Yiddish readers in his city. About 160 copies of

- 
- (5) Ettinger, S.: "The Jews in Russia at the outbreak of the Revolution", p.15, In Kochon, L. (ed.) The Jews in the Soviet Russia Since 1917, London, 1970.
- (6) Iggerot A.H., II, 119.

6

the Hebrew dailies Ha-Zeman, Ha-Sofeh, Ha-Mélis and Ha-Sefirah were sold in his city during that year (1901), while 500 copies of the two Yiddish dailies were sold there.<sup>(7)</sup> In another place we find that out of 2,000 readers of one public library there were only 50 Hebrew readers or 2%.<sup>(8)</sup>

The most comprehensive statistics of the Jewish reading public at that time were those that appeared in Ha-Shiloah under the title: "*Ha-yesh gore'im 'ivriyim?*"<sup>(9)</sup> by S. Goldberg. They were based on the annual report of the Poltavian library for the years 1904-1905. The total number of readers was 1362:

865	(65%)	read only Russian
70	(5%)	read only Yiddish
81	(7%)	read only Hebrew
336	(25%)	read in two languages

The total number of books and periodicals that were borrowed was 35,265:

28081	(80%)	in Russian
4617	(13%)	in Hebrew
2567	(7%)	in Yiddish

The total of 35,265 books and periodicals were divided as follows:

29344	(80%)	books
5921	(20%)	periodicals

---

(7) "Ba-sifrut ha-<sup>c</sup>ittit", Ha-Dor ii, 1904, No: 5, p.9.

(8) Ibid., No: 9-10, p.40.

(9) Ha-Shiloah xvii, pp.417-422.

The 4617 Hebrew books and periodicals were divided as follows:

2569 (56%) children's books  
 643 (14%) belles lettres  
 136 (3%) scientific literature  
 344 (7.5%) publicistics  
 925 (19.5%) periodicals

I. The books were divided as follows:

(a) Scientific:

889 (25%) general  
 840 (14%) Hebrew  
 1788 (50%) Judaica in Russian  
 201 (11%) Judaica in other languages

(b) Belles lettres:

11139 (86%) Russian  
 1159 ( 9%) Yiddish  
 643 ( 5%) Hebrew

(c) Children's books:

10266 (75%) Russian  
 2569 (25%) Hebrew

The total number of books were:

10509 (57%) for adults  
 12835 (43%) for children

Books for adults were divided as follows:

1294 (73%) belles lettres  
 3568 (27%) publicistics and science

II. The periodicals were divided as follows:

2249	(38%)	Russian
925	(15%)	Hebrew
1339	(22%)	Hebrew and Russian
1408	(25%)	Yiddish

The figures speak for themselves; they may be considered as characteristic of all Jewish communities in Eastern Europe at the turn of the century.

The emergence of a Jewish intelligentsia and their knowledge of Hebrew was decisively governed by the system of Jewish education during the past two centuries. Until about the end of the nineteenth century the *heder* was the only type of Jewish school in Eastern Europe and even in Germany - the first Jewish school with instruction in German was founded in Berlin in 1778. The *heder* was a private school in which a teacher - sometimes with one or more assistants - taught boys aged between 4 and 13. Instruction was limited to reading and writing in Yiddish and Hebrew. The latter was mainly for reading in the *Bible*, *Talmud* and other religious writings. The number of pupils at each *heder* was limited by its seating accommodation. There were generally two or three classes, graded according to age and capacity, and attending at different hours. The tuition was imparted through the medium of Yiddish. No *heder* for girls is mentioned in any of the documents of the time. The girls were taught at home to read the prayers, but they were seldom instructed in the Hebrew language. Instruction in the *heder* consisted

of memorizing texts by means of mechanical repetition. This method trained the memory, but the most important result of the *heder* was negative - the pupil learnt nothing of the intellectual developments of the previous thousand years; his attention was confined to ancient religious literature.

Beside the *heder* there was also a communal school for poor children and orphans, called *Talmud Torah*; it was maintained by voluntary contributions, and provided the same course of instruction. As for the rich, a private tutor was always the only method of education and here the emphasis was probably laid on general-human knowledge. At the age of 14 the *heder* boy could move up to *yeshivah* where he could continue the study of *Talmud* or else pursue his education by self-study in the local synagogue.

Whatever secular education was acquired by Jewish individuals here and there was the result of private instruction or personal initiative and persistence. All Government Schools were either closed to Jews or were boycotted by them. In the second half of the eighteenth century modern Jewish schools sponsored by the Government and supported by special taxes upon the Jewish community were established. Jewish intellectuals welcomed these schools, but the Jewish masses suspected that the schools were intended to wean Jewish children from Judaism.

"In 1873 it became apparent that, from the Government's point of view, the special Jewish elementary and secondary schools were no longer necessary, and they were

closed. Jewish youth was coming in increasing numbers to the general Russian Government schools. Nevertheless, they were comparatively few. Within twenty years, from 1853-1873, the percentage of Jews in the total student body rose from 1.25% to only 13.2%"(10)

The reasons for the failure of Jewish Government schools to be popular among most Jews were twofold<sup>d</sup>: (11)

The first group related to the outlook of the Jews and their social status. Orthodox Jews considered the *Haskalah* and this type of school as a form of gradual assimilation. Because the *Hasidic Rabbis* were afraid to lose the respect of the masses as a result of the widespread success of the *Haskalah*, they convinced these masses that Government schools were intended to convert their children from their religion and culture. For this reason the parents were very suspicious of the motives for the schools. Parents had little trust in the teachers and their knowledge of religious sources, and the latter were considered to be the only useful method of education. *Melammedim* relying only on what they could earn from teaching in the *heder* instigated the parents not to send their children to these schools by inventing kinds of pretexts. The poverty of some parents prevented them from sending their children to school, either because they needed their help in performing their daily work or for lack of food and clothes. As for those who were able, but did not want to send their children to school, they

---

(10) Finkelstein, L. (ed.) The Jews, their History, Culture and Religion, vol. iii, p.1264.

(11) Rosenthal, Y.L.: Toledot Hevrat Marbé Ha-Haskolah be yiśra'el be Eres Rusiyah; Vol. ii, 1885-90, pp.89-93. a/

probably preferred to keep their children all day in the *heder* rather than keep them only half a day at school; they would then be free from having to attend to the children during the other half of the day.

Secondly, there were reasons that derived from the rules and regulations of the schools. These schools, it was felt, did not fulfil their main objective. Most Jews were occupied in business and education must, they felt, be in line with their interests in order to prepare them for their future career. Because these schools offered an education which had no practical aim in life they were ignored. The same criticism applied to Jewish seminaries. The "Orthodox" complained that their graduates lacked depth of religious knowledge, while the "Progressives" complained that they lacked general knowledge and the ability to preach like learned people. Both factions were therefore dissatisfied with Government-supervised schools and their graduates. Moreover, the course of elementary schooling was frequently not completed because it did not give the Jewish boy the intensive knowledge of religious sources, commentaries and the Hebrew language that the parents expected. The *heder* was essential even for the children who attended Government schools.

Gradually the demand for religious reform became more vocal and insistent. The *Maskilim* contended that traditional Judaism which regulated every act of a Jew's daily life also produced a social and spiritual gulf in the path of Russification. This call for religious reform

came as a result of the desire to emerge from the old *ghetto*. It resulted in two trends. The first called for the reinterpretation of religion and the modernization of the synagogue service to make it more fitting to the condition of the time and the environment; the other called for complete assimilation by seeking secular education:

"Up to the fifties of the nineteenth century, Jewish intellectuals had practically no knowledge of Russian language or culture. The cultural language of the *Haskalah* in Russia, as in Prussia, was German. The other languages beside Yiddish which Russian Jews spoke were those of the social groups in whose midst they lived. In the fifties, the new type of *Maskil* produced by the *Rabbinic Seminaries* and Russian universities was educated in the literature and language of Russia." (12)

The religious institution which they were anxious to modernize was the synagogue; they regarded it as an effective medium of Russification.

The new religious and political development within Jewish communities led to the establishment of a new type of Jewish educational institute, the *Heder Metuqqan*, in order to bring secular education to the Jews as an alternative to the Government schools. The language of instruction in the *Heder Metuqqan* was Hebrew, and it was taught as a living language. There was less emphasis on religious matters and *Rabbinic* literature. This type of school also gave the Jew a chance to learn the vernacular and the most necessary branches of general knowledge.

---

(12) Greenberg, L.: The Jews in Russia, vol. i, 1976, p.101.



*Hevrat Marbē Ha-Haskalah be-Yisrael be-Eres Rusiyah* started to function from its central office in St. Petersburg on 18th December 1863. It played an important part in the development of Hebrew literature and the promotion of general cultural and secular education among the Jews of Russia. The Society was under the supervision of the Russian Ministry of Education; it admitted to membership persons of both sexes without distinction of faith. Evzel Günzburg was chosen as its President. The Society adopted a programme of three points for its activities. (13)

1. To promote the knowledge of the Russian language among Jews by republishing the textbooks which were first published by the Government in 1857 for teaching Russian to Jewish children; by publishing the history of the Jews in Russian and by giving moral and financial support to Jews who might have the talent to write and publish in Russian on Jewish matters or aspects which could be of use to the Jewish public.
2. To publish books on useful subjects like natural history, mathematics, geography and history, both general and Jewish, and to send Jewish periodicals free to High Schools and some of the lower schools and to public libraries.
3. To subsidize poor Jewish students in general schools, and to try to establish libraries and schools for Jews

---

(13) Rosenthal, op.cit., i, 1-3.

throughout Russia. The Society helped to finance some Hebrew periodicals by paying the full price of a number of copies which would then be sent free to Jewish schools and libraries.

In 1903 an educational periodical called Ha-Pedagog was published in Warsaw to promote the new European methods of teaching among teachers of the *Heder Metuqqan*..

In 1886 there were 5,200 girls in secondary schools and 18,000 students in Russian primary schools. During the same year the percentage of Jewish students in the universities of Kharkov and Odessa rose to 30%; in the educational region of Odessa Jews formed 35.2% of the number of secondary school pupils in 1881, and in the Vilna region they were 26.7%.<sup>(14)</sup> In 1893 there were 7,182 Jewish students in Odessa: 92 (18.7%) in the university, 1,263 in secondary, Government and public schools and 950 in *hadarim*.<sup>(15)</sup>

In the year 1896 there were 433 official Jewish schools (*Hadarim*) and many more non-official schools in Warsaw. The first *Heder Metuqqan* was founded there in 1885. In Odessa there were about 200 *hadarim* in which 5,000 pupils were enrolled. During that time there were about 6,500 girls and boys receiving education in 40 public and semi-public schools supervised by the Government.

- 
- (14) Sloutzky, Y.: "Semihatah shel ha-intelligentsia Ha-yehudit-Rusit", Zion XXV, 1960, No:3-4, p.227.  
 (15) Shohetman, b.: "Odessa", Arim we-immahot be yi'srael; p.66.

In the year 1903, the Jewish economist and statistician Jacob Leschzinsky published a complete and accurate statistical study of a small town in the province of Kiev which had been conducted four years earlier. In this study,<sup>(16)</sup> the author gave a clear picture of the economic, social and cultural life of the Jews in this town as a sample of Jewish towns throughout Russia. The population of the town was 12,000 Russians and 2,589 Jews. He classified the Jews according to their knowledge of languages as follows:

277	(10.7%)	could read and write only Hebrew
1028	(39.8%)	could read and write only Yiddish
878	(33.9%)	could read and write only Russian

As for women, most of them did not know any written language because the law prohibited the establishment of *hadarim* for girls. As a result of the efforts of young Zionists a public school was founded in which 100 girls received education. Another 60 girls were learning Hebrew and Russian in unauthorized *hadarim*. The number of *hadarim* in this town was 15; in them 231 pupils were enrolled. There was also a private school for boys which included 25 pupils, and one *Talmud Torah* which included 70 pupils. In addition to that, there were 27 boys learning privately, and 5 in secondary schools in other towns. The total number of boys receiving education was 293, while the total number of boys who were not receiving any education was 74 (19%) of those who were at the age

---

(16) *Ahad Ha-q'anna'im* (pseudonym): "Statistiqah shel 'ayyarah ahat; *Ha-Shiloah* xii, pp.87-96, 165-173.

of elementary education. On the other hand, about 90% of those who left *heder* did not have any knowledge of Hebrew other than reading the prayers. In this town there was a private Yiddish library which had 15-20 regular readers. As for Russian and Hebrew, there was a public library whose readers were only 140, divided as follows:

- 70    read only Russian
- 65    read Russian and Hebrew
- 5     read only Hebrew

This picture of Jewish educational methods and standards shows how impossible it was for the self-educated Jewish population to accommodate such a large number of Jewish publications in Hebrew and other languages. In addition, one must consider the effect of the mass emigration of Jews which followed the pogroms of 1881. The immigrants were the more energetic and independent characters and they left Europe for South America, Palestine, Africa, Australia and the United States. The number of Jewish immigrants into the United States from Russia in the years 1881-1890 totalled 135,003 souls.<sup>(17)</sup> This accelerated flow of emigration had some effect on the development of Hebrew literature.

Although Hebrew literature, as we have stated before, was already at a relatively sophisticated stage, it was by no means equal to the rest of European literatures. It did not satisfy the cultural needs of

---

(17)Greenberg, op.cit., ii, 73.

the Jews, and even those who knew Hebrew well preferred to read in the other languages which they knew. Kovner criticized Hebrew literature when he wrote in his famous book "*Heger Davar*":

"Because Jewish writers do not know or understand the spirit of the time or the needs of the people, we cannot expect them to write useful books for the masses... Why do they boast of spreading light in Israel when they themselves are immersed in darkness? Why do they so proudly proclaim their wisdom and knowledge when in reality they are ignoramuses."(18)

---

(18) Quoted in Greenberg, op.cit., i, 124-125.

## 2. HEBREW PERIODICALS BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HA-SHILOAH

Hebrew periodicals played an important role in the development of Hebrew literature in general and in the education of a new generation of Hebrew writers and readers in particular.

"The importance of a periodical is not only for literature but also for the writer. Only few writers can show all their talents, at their first appearance, with the best and most perfect of their works. A periodical has, therefore, great spiritual and psychological importance for us in order to know the beginnings of a writer and his early growth, his strength and his weakness, his success and his failure."(1)

The role of periodicals in the development and promotion of Hebrew literature and Jewish culture is felt more keenly than in any other literature because Hebrew was not a living language and because of the absence of organized educational and publishing systems. "There is hardly any literature in the world in which periodicals played as important a role in its development as modern Hebrew literature."(2) As day-to-day life became complicated in the materialistic sense of the word, people found that books did not satisfy their needs for wide knowledge of the entire world in which they lived. Only then was periodical literature created in the form of reporting current events, either in an informative or in a fictional style.

---

(1) Cohen, Yisrael; Aspaqlariyot, 1968, p.250.

(2) Waxman, M.; A History of Jewish Literature, vol. iii, p.333.

Hebrew periodical literature is not very old. Bibliographers are divided in their views about the first Hebrew periodical. Some say that it was the monthly Peri 'Es Hayyim which was published in Amsterdam in 1728-1776 by the seminary 'Es Hayyim, while others say that it was Bikkur' qasir of which only three issues appeared in Venice in 1715. However, Germany was the place in which the first journalistic attempt in Hebrew literature was made, in the second half of the eighteenth century, and then it spread gradually into Austria and Russia. These periodicals formed the battle-ground on which writers championed their different views. They also served as a medium through which instruction was imparted. It is in these periodicals that most Hebrew literature was printed, where the expression of different views were voiced and the discussion of contemporary problems were carried on. "Jewish periodical literature had always glowed hot with temperament, agitation, order, unrestrained outpourings of emotion."<sup>(3)</sup> We shall follow its chronological development first in Germany and Austria and then in Russia and Poland.

(a) Hebrew periodicals in Germany and Austria

In the year 1750 Moses Mendelssohn assisted by Tobias Boß commenced to publish a Hebrew weekly which they named Qohelet musar (the moral preacher). His aim

---

(3) Spiegel, S.: Hebrew Reborn, 1931, p.272.

was to raise the cultural level of the Jews and cultivate a taste for pure Hebrew which would replace the jargonized Hebrew of the *ghetto*. He set himself the task of refining the moral and aesthetic taste of the small number of Hebrew readers. But for some unaccountable cause, perhaps from lack of funds or literary material, the weekly ceased with its second issue. It can be assumed that its failure was due to the fact that the majority of Hebrew readers were mainly interested in religious writings and were not prepared for the style of the new periodical.

The second attempt at periodical literature was Ha-Meassef which was published as a monthly during the years 1784-97, with some interruptions, in Königsberg, Breslau and Berlin. In the year 1783, at the suggestion of Isaac Euchel, the Königsberg *Maskilim* formed "*Hevrat Doreshé Leshon <sup>C</sup>Ever*" with the aim of publishing a Hebrew periodical. This periodical, Ha-Meassef, became the symbol and standard-bearer of the *Haskalah* movement for many decades; a whole generation of Hebrew writers - *Dor ha-meassefim* is named after it. Ha-Meassef was to gather in all branches of learning, writings on various topics, subjects of a useful as well as entertaining nature. It was divided into five sections. The first was for poetry to indicate that the periodical was to be mainly belle~~l~~ettristic. The second section was that of essays which was subdivided into linguistic, exegetical, literary and Talmudical. The third was for biographical articles, the fourth for current news and the fifth for



reviews of current publications.<sup>(4)</sup>

Ha-Meassef was characterized by extreme moderation during the first three years of publication at Königsberg. It focussed its efforts on the need for the reform of the Jewish school curriculum. It was devoted to secular matters, literature, articles, historical accounts of great figures in the Jewish past, and current affairs. It aroused interest in the Bible as a literary creation, spread the knowledge of Hebrew grammar, and bridged the gap between Jewish culture and European culture.

Despite all the praise paid by many literary critics to this periodical for its valuable contribution to the development of Hebrew, there was, however, one writer, Bernfeld, who looked at it differently. He ignored the fact that it was a pioneer attempt, and described its literary quality as poor, its style as didactic and its material as tendentious. He maintained that it did not produce a single outstanding literary figure. He wrote:

"If we go through all its pages and chapters, we will search in vain for any scientific essay or weighty subject worthy of publication. They - the *Meassefim*-prided themselves on the fact that they were restoring the ancient glory of the Hebrew language, and railed at Jewish scholars of former years for their awkward style. But they have left us no essay written with taste and skill, not one poem that warms our hearts in the least or pleases us with its poetic beauty, not one sound idea that can be considered scientific. We hear nothing but babble, nothing but

---

(4) Davidson, Israel,: The Genesis of Hebrew Periodical Literature, 1900, p.13.

tasteless translations of German poetry. We are carried away by a flood of words without having a single subject clearly defined; we are swept away by a mighty stream of ditch water."(5)

The publication of Ha-Meassef was continued as Ha-Meassef He-Hadash which appeared irregularly during the following century. The first volume was published in 1809 in Berlin, the second in 1810 in Altona and the third and last appeared in 1811 in Dessau. Among those who took part in Ha-Meassef during its first period were M. Mendelssohn, N.H. Wessely, Joel Bril, Isaac Satanow, Baruch Landau, David Caro and David Franco-Mendes.

In the year 1841, another Hebrew monthly was published at Frankfort in Germany; this is considered by Klausner as the first monthly in Hebrew literature<sup>(6)</sup> - possibly because, unlike Ha-Meassef, it appeared regularly for two years 1841-1842. It was the monthly Zion which was issued in the form of one quire (16 pages) and was edited jointly by Michael Creizcnach and Marcus Jost. After the death of the former in 1842 the monthly suspended publication. An attempt was made in 1845 to resuscitate it but only one issue was published - in Leipzig by Jacob Goldenthal.

From Germany Hebrew periodical literature took a very large step forward by spreading into Austria. In the year 1820 the publication of the literary Hebrew annual Bikkuré Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittim started in Vienna. It was

---

(5) Bernfeld, S.: Dor Tohpukhot, pt. 11, pp.84-86

(6) Klausner, J.: Historyah shel ha-sifrut ha-<sup>c</sup>civrit ha-hadashah, vol. IV, p.54.

edited by Shalom Cohen, who was also the editor of Ha-Meassef He Hadash, and it appeared continuously until 1831. It was destined to play an exceptional role in the development of Hebrew literature.

"It was the seminary in which the early writers, poets and scholars of the first epoch of the second *Haskalah* period were nourished, trained and prepared for their future activity. It was there that the builders of 'Jewish Science', Solomon Judah Rapoport, Samuel David Luzzatto and Isaac Samuel Reggio, the poet Meir Letteres and the satirist Isaac Erter made their debut." (7)

The annual was published mainly in Hebrew but it included also some essays of Jewish interest in German, written in Hebrew characters, it also reprinted selected essays and poems of Ha-Meassef. Both periodicals were similar in tone and contents, and Bikkuré Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittim could be considered as a continuation of Ha-Meassef. The first few volumes of the former contained articles in German on Jewish and general contemporary life as well as useful information on business matters. Gradually the German essays were reduced to a minimum, the business information and the reprints from Ha-Meassef ceased.

Two attempts were made to continue the publication of Bikkuré Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittim in Vienna. The first was in 1844 by M.E. Stern but only one volume appeared; then the paper continued under the name Kokhavé Yesháq of which 37 volumes appeared during the years 1845-73. The second attempt was in 1845 by I.S. Reggio and I. Busch. This time, too, only one volume appeared under the name

---

(7) Waxman, op.cit., vol. iii, p.158.

Bikkuré Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittim Ha-H<sup>a</sup>dashim and this was the last.

When Bikkuré Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittim ceased publication in 1831, Samuel Lob Goldenberg started in 1833 to publish a new periodical of a more scientific and less rhetorical nature. This periodical was called Kerem Hemed and it appeared as an annual in Vienna and some other places until 1856 with some short interruptions. It consisted of letters either exchanged between scholars or writers and the editor. The first two volumes appeared in Vienna in 1833 and 1836, volumes 3-7 (1838-43) appeared in Prague, and volumes 8 and 9 (1854, 1856) appeared in Berlin.

Another important periodical was He-Halus, the scientific annual which appeared throughout the years 1852-1883 only; however, thirteen volumes appeared during the whole of this period. The first three volumes were published in Lobou in the years 1852, 1853 and 1857, volumes 4-6 in Breslau in the years 1859, 1860 and 1862. Volumes 7,8 in Frankfort in the years 1865 and 1869. The ninth volume appeared in two parts in 1873 in Prague and volumes 10 and 11, also in Prague, in the years 1877 and 1880. Finally, volumes 12, 13 were published in Vienna in the years 1887 and 1889. It was edited by Joshua Schorr.

(b) Hebrew periodicals in Russia and Poland

The size of Russian Jewry in the nineteenth century was so great - in some cities reaching the proportion of 35% of the general population - that the Hebrew press in

Russia is considered to be the most important. It was destined for the intellectual and the learned and was supported by *Hibbat Zion* and the Zionist movement for nationalist motives. It wandered from one city to another according to necessity and changing conditions; in some places the cost of printing and publishing was cheaper, in others the district governor was kinder or the censor responsible for the Hebrew press less strict. For these reasons one may find duplication in the towns where some papers appeared; the weekly Ha-Dor, for example, was published in Cracow where printing facilities were better and cheaper and there was no censorship, while it was edited and circulated from Warsaw. We will consider any periodical destined for Russian Jewry as published in Russia even if this was not the case.

Rivalry between Hebrew literary centres like Warsaw and Odessa encouraged the tendency of those Jewish communities to publish their own periodicals in order to spread the views of their own writers. This process led to the development of a new Hebrew style, the cultivation of new literary talents and the education of a wide range of Hebrew readers. In some cases the influence of Hebrew periodicals extended beyond the centres in which they were published. From a statistical point of view the Hebrew periodicals which appeared in Russia form about one quarter of all Hebrew periodicals published in the whole world during the years 1728-1918:

"During this period the Jewish press in the Diaspora amounted to 3,385 periodicals in 28 languages. Of these 635 were in Hebrew, 1,443 in Yiddish, 496 in English, 538 in German, 200 in Russian, 105 in French and 103 in Spanish... The Hebrew periodicals which appeared in Russia were 144 out of the total of 635. According to their place of publication the Hebrew periodicals in Russia were divided as follows: 45 in Warsaw, 27 in St. Petersburg, 23 in Odessa, 14 in Vilna, 10 in Moscow, 6 in Kiev, 6 in Berdishev, 2 in Poltava, 2 in Patrecov..."<sup>(8)</sup>

If we add to these figures the periodicals which were published outside Russia while intended for Russian Hebrew readers, the proportion will be about one-third of the total number of Hebrew periodicals.

There had been several attempts by the *Maskilim* of Russia to publish a Hebrew periodical but none of them materialized. The first attempt had already been in 1804, when N.H. Shulman called for subscriptions to a Hebrew weekly; his proposal did not succeed. The second attempt was made during the years 1829-1833 when three *Maskilim* from Vilna, Z.H. Klatcheko, Z.H. Katzenelbogen and M. Nathanson, decided to publish a literary-scientific Hebrew annual, but they also did not succeed.<sup>(9)</sup> At the end of the thirties and the beginning of the forties of the nineteenth century the Russian government was keen on introducing reform in the life of Russian Jews so that they would be assimilated within Russian society. In 1841, Max Lilienthal was appointed as head of a project for the reform of the Jewish educational system. This step by

- 
- (8) A.Z. Ben-Yishay: "120 Shanah la-<sup>c</sup>Ittonut ha-<sup>c</sup>Ivrit be-Rusiyah, S.H.S.H., 1962, pp.157-66.  
 (9) Elkoshi, G: "Ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittonut ha-<sup>c</sup>Ivrit be Vilna Ba-me'ah ha-19", He-<sup>c</sup>Avar, xiii, p.59.

the government encouraged the *Maskilim* to open two modern schools in Vilna in 1841. In the same city and during the same year the first Hebrew periodical in Russia, Pirhé Safon, was published by L. Hurwitz and S.J. Fuenn. They did not define the frequency of its publication. The articles in the first issue (of 54 pages) were varied in subject-matter in order to satisfy a wide range of readers. The editors did not commit themselves to regular publication because only the material which they would receive would decide how often issues could be published.

"Furthermore, we have not obtained a permit from the government to publish a periodical; and we have not committed ourselves to a programme and objectives for the paper."(10)

In a letter to Y. Bar Levinsohn the editors stated that they were thinking of publishing the second issue in less than a month after the first one.<sup>(11)</sup> This hope was not fulfilled until the year 1844, perhaps on account of lack of money or due to obstacles by the censorship or for both reasons. The second issue was very similar to the first in contents but it was four times as large (218 pages). It was also the last because the censor informed its editors that if they wanted to continue with the publication they would have to obtain permission.<sup>(12)</sup> In Russia at that time this was very difficult.

---

(10) Elkoshi, op.cit., p.65.

(11) Quoted in Elkoshi, op.cit., p.65.

(12) Ibid., p.65.

When the paper Pirhé Safon ceased publication in 1844 the need for a Hebrew periodical was very serious among the *Maskilim* of Russia if they were to be kept informed about events in the Jewish communities and to be linked culturally with the world outside the ghetto. For nearly four years, several attempts were made to obtain a permit for a Hebrew periodical in Russia . The first was in 1850 when Samuel Warshawsky handed a petition to the Russian Minister of Education requesting authorization to open a Jewish printing press and to issue a Hebrew paper in one of the cities, but his request was refused. The second attempt was in 1851 when the director of the *Rabbinical* seminary at Zhitomir applied to the Governor-General of Kiev to permit the inspector of the seminary to issue a Hebrew periodical entitled Leqah Tov. This request was also refused. At the beginning of 1855, Moses Eliezer Beilinson asked Benjacob to discuss with the *Maskilim* of Vilna the idea of publishing a Hebrew weekly; but the latter rejected the proposal for the reason that there was little chance of success. Then Beilinson suggested the idea to the *Maskilim* of Odessa; but while he was making all the efforts to materialize his dream, Eliezer Silbermann (1829-89) was proceeding successfully towards achieving the goal of issuing a Hebrew weekly for Russian Jewry. To avoid administrative problems he decided to have it published in the East Prussian town of Lyck. In the summer of 1855 he circulated an announcement entitled "qol Meva'sser" declaring in it his



intention to publish a weekly called Ha-Maggid. He obtained official authorization from the Russian government to ship his periodical into Russia, but the issues of the weekly were to be sent through the post-office at Warsaw or Vilna where there ~~was~~ a censor for Jewish printed material.

The first issue of the first Hebrew weekly appeared on the first of Sivan 1856 with Silbermann as its editor; he continued to edit it until 1879. This issue consisted of four folio pages. Its subtitle was "Mikhtav le-qorot ha-yamim, yaggid le-ya<sup>C</sup>aqo<sup>V</sup> me-ba-na<sup>C</sup>aseh be-khol helqé tevel ben kol yoshev heled'asher yin<sup>C</sup>am we 'asher ra'uy leda<sup>C</sup>at le-khol'ish Yiśra'eli leto<sup>C</sup>alto ule-to<sup>C</sup>elet ha-śafah ha-<sup>C</sup>ivrit ha-nehmadah." The printing of the first issue took two weeks. The second number appeared on August 3rd, and by the end of 1856 only five issues had been published.

The chief interest of the weekly was to show Russian-Polish Jews the right way to follow in order to find grace with the government. Despite this patriotism passages of Ha-Maggid were frequently marked with the black ink of the censor before it reached its subscribers in Russia and Poland. It was originally an informative weekly and during the early years, news and bits of political discussion formed the central part of the periodical. In it representatives of moderate orthodoxy defended their position against the more radical *Maskilim* who demanded religious and social reforms. The editor who was not a great linguist or literary stylist was also of quite

limited knowledge. On the other hand he had practical sense and understood how to adapt his journal to the taste and requirements of his readers.

There was a literary supplement to Ha-Maggid called Ha-Sofeh. Silbermann was helped a great deal in the preparation of Ha-Maggid by David Gordon (1831-86) who became Associate Editor from 1859. When Gordon started his work in Ha-Maggid the policy of the periodical was changed. He introduced political reviews, established a section for popular scientific and historical articles to which he himself contributed, and a column for criticism and book reviews. He was also responsible for correcting the language and the style not only of the contributors but also of Silbermann himself. In 1880, Gordon became the sole editor and owner of the weekly, and henceforward he was able to convert it completely into a thoroughly modern journal. When David Gordon died in 1886, the publication of the weekly was continued by his son Dov Gordon. The new owner gave its editorship to several writers and each changed its policy according to his own views. These changes led to a sharp drop in the number of subscribers until it ceased publication in 1891. In an attempt to revive the weekly, it was transferred to Berlin to be edited there by J.S. Fuchs and later by his brother I.S. Fuchs. In 1892 the latter transferred it to Cracow and changed its name into Ha-Maggid He-Hadash, but neither the change of place nor that of editors

31

rescued Ha-Maggid from its fate. It suspended publication, after forty years, in 1893.

The second important Hebrew periodical in Russia was the weekly Ha-Karmel, founded in Vilna in 1860 by Samuel Joseph Fuenn. As early as 1856 Fuenn requested permission to issue a Hebrew weekly entitled Ha-Karmel in Vilna. The permit was granted on October 22, 1859 and the first issue of the journal appeared on June 14, 1860 with the subtitle "*Mikhtav Citti lē-venē Yiśra'el bi šefat qodesh Cim nosafot bi-lešon Russiyah we-Ashkenaz.*" Fuenn possessed more knowledge than Silberman but was less suitable for editing a popular social journal. Journalism was not his metier. However, he promised his readers the discussion of Jewish scholarship in various fields, but little of his promises were carried out. The aim of the journal was to effect a reconciliation between Orthodox and Progressive. The leading Jewish scholars of that time took part in Ha-Karmel as permanent contributors in acknowledgement of Fuenn's high scholarly standing.

The publication of Ha-Karmel was made possible by the liberal tendency which characterized the reign of Alexander II. The previous Tsar, Nicholas I had refused to allow the publication of special periodicals for the Jews for fear that this would strengthen their national feelings and affect his policy aimed at the conversion of Jews and their assimilation into general Russian society. Fuenn succeeded in obtaining the permit because he was highly regarded as the general supervisor of all

23 23  
Jewish government schools in the Vilna educational province.

The publication of Ha-Karmel was allowed on condition that it would be devoted only to scientific literature and to discussion of the cultural and social life of the Jews in Russia; it was not permitted to treat of political events. This restriction made it difficult for Ha-Karmel to stand in rivalry with Ha-Maggid since the main interest of Hebrew readers at that time was current events. Each issue of Ha-Karmel had eight pages with double columns, and was divided into two sections of four pages each; a general section which was mainly informative, and the scientific-literary section called Ha-Sharon. During the fifth year, the issue was reduced to four pages, the scientific section having disappeared completely; from the beginning of its sixth year the issue was restored to its original form with the financial help of the Society for Promoting *Haskalah* in Russia. The German supplement was short-lived. As for the Russian supplement, the editor considered publishing it as a separate weekly but without success. From the beginning of its sixth year the weekly was supported by the Society for Promoting *Haskalah* in Russia. In the year 1866, the Society allocated the sum of 300 roubles from its funds and another 300 roubles contributed by its Chairman as a subsidy for the Russian supplement.<sup>(13)</sup> About the end of 1862 Fuenn opened his own printing house and printed

---

(13) Rosenthal, op.cit., ii, 29.

Ha-Karmel himself from its third year. This step made the publication of Ha-Karmel, which never had more than 500 subscribers, much easier. (14)

In the issue of 19 February 1871, the editor announced that his weekly Ha-Karmel would be converted into a monthly by permission of the Government. During its eleven years of publication as a weekly only seven volumes of Ha-Karmel had been completed. Each volume included 50 copies; the eighth volume was incomplete (37 issues only). The first issue of the monthly appeared in October 1871. Each issue was about 54-56 pages. Around the end of the seventies the financial position of the monthly was not satisfactory because its circulation was small. There was too wide a gap between the old generation of Fuenn and the young generation of Hebrew readers and writers who were not satisfied with the type of material published in Ha-Karmel. The monthly was published irregularly until it finally ceased publication in December 1880.

Ha-Karmel had not been much superior to Pirhé Safon of 1841, which had been established by the same group of writers. These writers were men of solid but unsystematic knowledge and isolated from real life. They were not in a position to produce an interesting journal, not only in regard to social questions but even in the purely literary sense. However, the contribution of Ha-Karmel had consisted mainly in

---

(14) Elkoshi, He-<sup>c</sup>Avar xiii, p.88.

aiding the development of Hebrew literature and stimulating the new school of literary criticism championed by A.N. Kovner and A.J. Papirno; in its last years it had served as a school for young publicists.

The third important Hebrew periodical in Russia was the weekly Ha-Mélish, established in Odessa by Alexander Zederbaum (1816-1893) and Aaron Goldenblum (1827-1913). They requested permission to issue a periodical in Hebrew and German with Hebrew letters. The German press owner Nizche of Odessa had Hebrew type, and Zederbaum entered into partnership with him. The first issue appeared on 29 September 1860; it continued as a weekly until 1882, as a semi-weekly from 1883 to 1885, and finally as a daily newspaper to 1905. In 1871 it was transferred to St. Petersburg and remained there until it ceased to appear. Its publication was interrupted from 1873 to 1878. Its name and subtitle indicated that Ha-Mélish was intended to be "a mediator between the Jewish people and the Government, between religion and enlightenment."

Unlike other editors Zederbaum opened the first issue of his paper with an editorial, and thus it was he who initiated the editorial in Hebrew Journalism.<sup>(15)</sup> During the first few years the editor used to print in Ha-Mélish articles in German written in Hebrew characters. In 1863, however, he decided to publish a German supplement called Qol Mevaśśer which was of a literary and belletristic

---

(15) Malakhi, A.R.: "Ha-Mélish we-<sup>c</sup>orkhaw", Ha-Doar xli, 1960, p.232.

nature and continued to appear every week until 1871.

Qol Mevaššer was one of ten supplements to Ha-Méliš.

The others were all in Hebrew and were all single publications except Hosafah Madda<sup>C</sup>it, which was published as a quarterly during the years 1871-1872 and edited by Z.G. Rabinowitz.

Although Ha-Méliš contained a lively and controversial discussion of current events, its main object was publicistics and information. It gave much space to reports on matters of Jewish interest from correspondents all over the Pale of Settlement. This policy made Ha-Méliš very popular among the Hebrew readers of that time.

Zederbaum had a habit of adding to articles of his contributors' comments often longer than the articles themselves; there he expressed his own views on the matter under discussion or refuted those of the writers.

Despite its popularity, Ha-Méliš was always in financial difficulty because of the small number of its subscribers and that was, perhaps, the reason for publishing all these supplements and distributing them free in order to attract more subscribers. "During the first two years Ha-Méliš was not only unprofitable but also led to a substantial loss of the editor's money because the number of its subscribers was less than a thousand."<sup>(16)</sup> In order to reduce the cost of publication Zederbaum opened his own printing house but this step was

---

(16) Zitron, S.L.: "Reshimot le-toledot he-<sup>C</sup>ittonut ha-<sup>C</sup>Ivrit", Ha-<sup>C</sup>Oqlam, 1913.

of little help. After three years of struggle he had no alternative but to ask for the help of the Society for Promoting *Haskalah* in Russia, and they agreed in 1864 to give him financial support on condition that he should open in Ha-Mélis a special section, to be edited by H.Z. Slonimski, for natural science. Zederbaum accepted the condition and from issue 42 of the fourth year Ha-Mélis was divided into two sections, the first for short stories and publicistics and the other for natural history. After four months the editor announced that this experiment was not successful and that Ha-Mélis would revert to its original form. As a result the support of the Society was stopped.

In 1871, Ha-Mélis moved to St. Petersburg but the change of place did not change its future and once again the editor had to ask for the help of the Society. They offered him 500 roubles to finance the publication of a scientific supplement, called Hosafah Madda<sup>cit.</sup>(17) Towards the end of 1878 the poet J.L. Gordon became associate editor of the weekly. He was paid 225 roubles as a monthly salary which no doubt, was much for a periodical like Ha-Mélis. His co-operation effected an improvement in the style of the articles. When Gordon resigned his place was given to J.L. Kantor for a monthly salary of 150 roubles. The number of subscribers dropped from 2006 at the beginning of 1886 to

---

(17) Rosenthal, op.cit., i, 73.



1300 in the last quarter of the year, and in the following year from 2700 to 1400.<sup>(18)</sup> After the death of Zederbaum his assistant Leon Rabinowitz became editor. The policy of the paper did not change and it remained the organ of *Hibbat Zion*.

Ha-Mélish exerted great influence on Jewish life and gave impetus both to the development of Hebrew literature and to the rise of its standards.

"The history of Ha-Mélish is the history of the development of Enlightenment among the élite of the Jewish intelligentsia from the sixties of the last century onwards... Ha-Mélish was in its time the one and only Hebrew platform on which were to be heard from time to time free words, radical ideas, and a strong call to escape from the old traditions, to break the shackles and transmit values in the life of the individual and the community. Ha-Mélish created progressive Jewish public opinion and controlled it. Ha-Mélish reared, educated and established the first and second generations of Hebrew writers who are worthy of this title."<sup>(19)</sup>

Like all other Hebrew journals Ha-Mélish did not pay its contributors any honorarium. Most of them considered the publication of their works in one of these periodicals a great achievement.

Another important Hebrew periodical - this time in Poland - was the weekly Ha-Sefirah, founded in Warsaw by N.Z. Slonimski (1810-1904). At the end of 1861 Slonimski obtained a permit from the censorship to publish his weekly.

---

(18) Ungerfeld, M.: "Iggerot Zederbaum <sup>c</sup>orekh Ha-Mélish" He-Avar xi, 1945, p.145.

(19) Zitron; Ha-Olam, 1913.

In January 1862, he published an ideal programme of four points for his policy. On the 23rd of the same month appeared the first issue of Ha-Sefirah.<sup>(20)</sup> In his programme Slonimski gave priority to scientific articles and political and publicistic discussion was omitted. This deficiency disappointed the many readers whose interest was mainly in publicistics. Slonimski therefore asked the censorship to allow him to devote a section of his weekly to political discussion and his request was granted. He offered this section to several writers, among them J.L. Gordon, but when he did not find any writer to undertake responsibility for it Slonimski continued the publication of Ha-Sefirah without publicistics as before.

After the weekly had succeeded in establishing itself came the announcement in the issue of July 25, 1862 that that was to be the last issue. The editor was to move from Warsaw to Zhitomir because he had been appointed inspector of the Rabbinical Seminary as well as censor of Hebrew publications and books there. Twelve years passed before Ha-Sefirah resumed publication, this time in Berlin on 8th July 1874.

During this interruption the Society for Promoting *Haskalah* in Russia approached Slonimski in an attempt to resume the publication of Ha-Sefirah in Zhitomir

---

(20) With the subtitle: "Mikhtav<sup>c</sup> itti Mashmia<sup>c</sup> Hadashot Be-qerev<sup>c</sup> Am yeshurun me-kol ha-devarim ha-noge<sup>c</sup>im lahem be<sup>c</sup> inyan<sup>c</sup> ha medinah, divre<sup>c</sup> hokhmah u-madda<sup>c</sup>, yedio<sup>c</sup> t ha-<sup>c</sup>olam we-ha-teva<sup>c</sup>."

offering to support the weekly if it were devoted to natural science. Slonimski agreed on condition that the Society would use its influence with the proper government bureau to authorize him to be both editor and censor of Ha-Sefirah and to obtain for him permission to establish his own printing house in Zhitomir; otherwise S.J. Abramowitz should be the editor while he himself would be his assistant. He requested furthermore that the Society should support the paper with one thousand roubles a year. (21) The Society did not agree to the idea of nominating anyone to the editorship but Slonimski. (22) They

"proposed that Ha-Sefirah be combined with Ha-Mélis in the following way: that Ha-Mélis would begin appearing with a special supplement, under Slonimski's exclusive editorship; and this would be especially devoted to natural science and purely technical questions. The project, however, pleased neither Slonimski nor Zederbaum, and after lengthy negotiations nothing came of it." (23)

After some time he wanted to return to Warsaw in order to resume the publication of Ha-Sefirah. But the permit of 1861 had expired and it was not easy to obtain a new one; he then went to Berlin and resumed publication there. The paper did not change much from its original policy except that in Berlin a new column on political and publicistic matters was added to it under the charge of J.L. Kantor.

---

(21) Rosenthal, op.cit., 7, 11, 16, 19, 30.

(22) Katz, Ben-Zion: "Yovel ha-<sup>c</sup>Ittonut ha-<sup>c</sup>Ivrit ha-mehuddeshet", He-<sup>c</sup>Avar ii, p.5.

(23) Zinberg, I.: A History of Jewish Literature, translated and edited by Bernard Martin, Vol. xii, N.Y 1978, p.29.

Slonimski did not cease to try to take his weekly back to Warsaw, and eventually he succeeded in obtaining a new permit. The first issue of the revived Ha-Sefirah in Warsaw appeared on the 9th September 1875. During that year the Society gave him 100 roubles from its funds, 150 roubles was a contribution from the deputy chairman and 150 roubles from the treasurer. In return for this money, the editor was asked to send Ha-Sefirah free to *Rabbis*, Jewish schools, and Jewish libraries.<sup>(24)</sup> The Society continued to support the publication of Ha-Sefirah.

The belles lettres section in the paper was very poor; it included no poems. On the other hand, the scientific section was very rich in both original and translated material. Ha-Sefirah was primarily devoted to the popularization of scientific knowledge among Jews. It occupied during the seventies of the last century a minor place in influence on Jewish life and on Hebrew literature.

Nahum Sokolow began to write for Ha-Sefirah in 1876 when he was only nineteen. His articles made the weekly very popular among readers of Hebrew and increased the number of its subscribers - they previously had been only 1500.<sup>(25)</sup> Ten years later (1886) Sokolow became formally an Associate editor of Ha-Sefirah but in fact he was the sole editor. Sokolow turned the weekly gradually

---

(24) Rosenthal, op.cit., i, 124.

(25) Sokolow, N. Ishim, p.190.

into a publicistic medium. Against the wish of its founder Ha-Sefirah became a daily from 6th April 1886. Sokolow was opposed to Hibbat Zion but his attitude changed after the first Zionist Congress, in 1897. The change was immediately reflected in Ha-Sefirah and thenceforth it became an organ of the Zionist movement. Its influence among circles of middle-class intelligentsia as well as among orthodox readers, especially those of the younger generation, greatly improved its circulation. This reached a height of 13,000 subscribers before the outbreak of the First World War. Ha-Sefirah published several supplements and Jubilee volumes; the most important were Gilyonot la-Shabbat, issued weekly in 1904 and including articles, stories, essays and poems of high quality.

From 1905, Sokolow's editorship was only nominal. In that year he became Secretary of the World Zionist Organization and this involved his absence from Warsaw where Ha-Sefirah was published. The publication of Ha-Sefirah continued with long interruptions until 1931.

During the second half of the nineteenth century there were other Hebrew periodicals of some importance but only one of them achieved great success and played an important role in the development of Hebrew literature, that is Ha-Shahar<sup>(26)</sup> (1869-1884). The publication of the monthly Ha-Shahar, was established in Vienna by Peretz

---

(26) With the subtitle: "Ya'ir netiv <sup>C</sup>al darké bené Yisra'el ba-zeman he-<sup>C</sup>avar we-ha-howeh;" and from the second issue onward the subtitle was: "Az yebbaq<sup>C</sup> ka-shahar orekhah wa-'arukhatekhah meherah tismah"; Isaiah 58; 8.

Smolenskin, was a notable step forward in the history of the Hebrew press and Hebrew literature. Although it appeared in Vienna it was read principally in Russia. It had been established by funds provided by Smolenskin's brother and others. About the end of 1868 Smolenskin published Aleh le-dugmah that was intended to be the manifesto of the new monthly pursuing a twofold aim: to light the fanaticism of the benighted masses, on one hand, and combat the indifference ~~to~~ Judaism of the intellectuals, on the other:

"Let us be like all other nations in pursuing and acquiring knowledge, in forsaking the way of wickedness and folly, in being faithful citizens in the countries where we are scattered. But let us also be like other nations in not being ashamed of the quarry whence we were hewn... We feel no shame in holding fast to the ancient language that has gone about with us from one country to another and in which our seers and poets have sung."(27)

Each issue (about 56 pages) was divided into five sections, the first for scientific articles, the second for belles lettres and book reviews, the third for articles on religious matters, the fourth for publicistic and the fifth section for translations of famous works and interpretations. Despite the disorganization of the first issue of Ha-Shahar it was generally good. One should bear in mind that

"apart from the monthly Zion (1841-1842) which was edited by Michael Creizenach and Marcus Jost and ceased publication 25 years before the establishment of Ha-Shahar, there was no other Hebrew monthly which could have served as a model for Smolenskin's monthly."(28)

(27) Klausner, J.: A short history of modern Hebrew literature, 1928, p.88.

(28) Klausner, J.: Historyah shel ha-sifrut ha-ivrit he-hadashah, V, 62

Smolenskin was one of a new generation of writers who realized at that time the importance of the "Science of Judaism" and the value of publicistics and belles lettres. The balance between these three sections is clear throughout the twelve volumes of Ha-Shahar. About one third - one quire - was written by the editor himself and most of his works appeared in Ha-Shahar in that way. If there was a lack of good literary and critical material, the editor would fill the gaps himself or would deviate from his policy and accept whatever may have come to him despite his disapproval. (29)

Smolenskin's aim was to change the features of the progressive Hebrew press by avoiding the imitation of other contemporary Hebrew periodicals and by setting Ha-Shahar free from being devoted entirely to the "Science of Judaism". He wanted to teach the reading public, through Ha-Shahar, to appreciate literature and good literary taste. (30) The editor gave wide space in his monthly to literary criticism and reviews to which he himself was a frequent contributor. He wanted this section to be objective and interesting, but gradually he was forced into polemics with other periodicals and writers. The personal element in these polemics can easily be realized from his footnotes to his own articles and those of other writers. Smolenskin was

---

(29) Vilnai, S. (Verses), "Ha-Sifrut ha-Cittit be-aspaqlariah shel Ha-Shahar", Gilyonot XXVI, 358.

(30) Ibid., 354.

acting contrary to the opinion he had previously held.

"If", he had warned, "someone dares to insult his opponent whoever he may be I shall not pay attention to his work. The critic should be concerned only with the book and not with the author, and the author can reply to his critic provided he does not praise him." (31)

Soon Ha-Shahar became very popular among readers of Hebrew and there is no doubt that it had tremendous influence on the education of its readers. They were known as "the generation of Ha-Shahar." One of the advantages of Ha-Shahar was the "co-ordination between the monthly and its readers who had trust in it and respect for it. In Ha-Shahar they found enough to satisfy their literary requirements. They neither suspected nor criticized what appeared in it." (32) The younger generation found in it a response to the thoughts that agitated it. Here readers learned to think logically and critically and to distinguish between the essential elements in Judaism and in Hebrew literature in general. This development led to a strong need for a new generation of Hebrew writers who could satisfy the requirements of this newly educated generation of Hebrew readers. Ha-Shahar acted as a school for the new generation of writers.

The publication of Ha-Shahar was always subject to long delays either because of lack of funds or because of lack of good material. Smolenskin was not only the

---

(31) Ha-Shahar, vol 1, No.3.

(32) Bernfeld, S.: "Ha-Sifrut ha-Cittit bi-leshon-Civrit", Ha-Shiloah xvii, 303.



editor but also the administrator. He had to exchange correspondence with contributors, subscribers, censor and distributors and he was also the treasurer. He described how difficult was his work:

"The publication of Ha-Shahar imposed a heavy burden on my shoulders and involved me in enormous labour which devoured all my time without granting me a moment's respite. For during the first three years of its publication, far from bringing me any reward for my toil, Ha-Shahar compelled

me to work like a slave in order to support myself and keep the journal alive, since the expenditure far exceeded its income. Like a doting mother who shirks no task, however wearisome, for the sake of her offspring, I cared for it and nursed it, reared it and kept it alive. I deprived myself of sleep and enjoyed no relaxation. During that time I acted as contributor-in-chief, proof reader, accountant, office boy, clerk and editor, performing all these functions alone without any assistance."(33)

Ha-Shahar received regular financial help from the "Alliance Israelite Universel" and from the "Society for Promoting *Haskalah* in Russia", as well as large sums of money which were collected from rich Jews all over Europe by Smolenskin and his brother during their fund-raising tours. On the other hand some contributors did not take any honorarium for their contributions. Almost all the talented Hebrew writers of the time contributed to Ha-Shahar.

Ha-Shahar met with strong opposition from some factions of the Hebrew reading public. The *Maskilim*

---

(33) Patterson, D.: The Hebrew Novel in Czarist Russia, p.40.

opposed it because of Smolenskin's criticism of Mendelssohn and his philosophy, and the *Hasidim* opposed it because of his criticism of the Orthodox Jews, while the young socialists considered his nationalism to be reactionary. This attitude of Hebrew readers caused him the loss of many subscribers. During one of his tours Smolenskin met an Orthodox leader of the German community who promised to give regular financial help to Ha-Shahar if Smolenskin agreed to make it the organ of the German *Hasidim*. The reply of Smolenskin was: "It is easier to sell my body than to sell my soul".<sup>(34)</sup> When his distributor in Russia advised him to modify his views in order to attract more subscribers he said:

"My aim is not to attract contributors who want only what they like, in return for their money. If I had done that from the beginning, the number of contributors would have increased, but in that case Ha-Shahar could have become like Ha-Sefirah and Ha-Melis. I would rather suspend its publication than spoil my soul and mind for the sake of some fools who are ignorant and unwilling to be educated... I publish Ha-Shahar in order to provide knowledge for those who want it. As for those who do not want it they will turn their backs on Ha-Shahar and I shall not chase them. It is easier to labour for Ha-Shahar without any reward than to sell my honour in return for money."<sup>(35)</sup>

This sort of moral attitude is similar to that of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am when, as we shall see, he refused the pressure of the readers and the publishers of Ha-Shiloah on him to change its character.

---

(34) Klausner: Historyah... vol. v, p.54.

(35) Brainin, R: Peretz ben Mosheh Smolenskin, Hayyaw u-sefaraw, p.140.

Smolenskin was dealing with his subscribers directly except those in Russia who were the majority of his readers. All the issues of Ha-Shahar had to be passed to the readers through a general agent in one of the Russian cities in which there was a censor. The general agent, in his turn, had to engage agents in remote places. This arrangement was very costly for Ha-Shahar because the editor had to give the issues at a reduced price to the general agent to enable the latter to offer a reduction to the small agents. Moreover the remaining money never reached the editor in time. "Since I have first published Ha-Shahar until now I did not succeed in Russia... Each year I send ~~the~~ issues to 600-800 subscribers and in each year I lose more than 1000 roubles. (36)

In 1878 Smolenskin came out with a good idea in order to secure the publication of Ha-Shahar. He decided to publish a weekly which would attract the readers who found the standard of Ha-Shahar too high for them and those who preferred to read about every day events rather than to read belles lettres or scientific studies. The first issue of the weekly Ha-Mabbitt appeared on 12th February 1878. After only four months Smolenskin realized that the weekly was far from successful. He therefore decided to publish another periodical which he called Ha-Mabbitt le-Yisra'el and to publish them both

---

(36) Ibid., p.82.

fortnightly with a week's interval between them. The first issue of Ha-Mabbitt le-Yisra'el appeared on 5th June 1878; apart from current events, it also provided space for belles lettres and articles on subjects of Jewish interest. The new periodical diverted the attention of Smolenskin from Ha-Shahar and this reduced the number of the subscribers to them both. But because the new periodicals did not improve the financial position of the editor, he decided to suspend their publication and to put all his efforts back into Ha-Shahar. Only seventeen issues of Ha-Mabbitt and nine issues of Ha-Mabbitt le Yisra'el were published.

"They did not influence either the reading public or Hebrew writers. The generation of the late seventies was not capable of understanding the importance of a weekly of high standard addressing itself to the Jew as a human being without any serious discussion of questions of religious faith and belief."(37)

One has to bear in mind that the publication of the three periodicals was the work of an individual and carried the personal seal of Smolenskin. Because of the illness which culminated in his death Smolenskin did not see the last issues 9-12 of volume 12 - the last volume of Ha-Shahar. They were edited and published by his brother in 1885. Ha-Shahar had appeared from 1869 to 1884 with three intervals. The first interval was in 1870 after its first year and the second was in 1879 following the ninth volume. The third was during the

---

(37) Klausner: Historyah... vol v, p.132.

years 1881-1882. Ha-Shahar published several books in serial form with special pagination. From 1876 Smolenskin became a partner in the printing house in which Ha-Shahar was printed. Each twelve issues (one year) were bound in a volume of 700 - 750 pages with a title page and table of contents for the whole volume divided into sections according to the subjects.

In addition to Ha-Shahar some other periodicals deserve mention. The first, is the annual Ha-'Asif which appeared in Warsaw during the years 1884-89 and in 1894, edited by N. Sokolow. It was very successful, and the circulation of the first volume was 10,000 copies, while the second volume was sold in 15,000 copies.<sup>(38)</sup> This rate of success continued throughout its six years of publication. Another periodical which played a notable role in the history of Hebrew journalism was the first Hebrew daily, Ha-Yom. It was established in St. Petersburg, by J.L. Kantor in 1886. It was Ha-Yom which forced Ha-Sefirah and Ha-Mélis to turn into dailies because of its success and its popularity. Only a few days after the appearance of the prospectus of Ha-Yom it had already 2,400 subscribers, nevertheless, it ceased publication at the beginning of 1888 because of financial difficulties, these were the result of its rivalry with the other two Hebrew dailies, especially Ha-Mélis which was also published in St. Petersburg.

---

(38) Sokolow: op.cit., p.165.

Ha-Yom was a European journal in the full sense of the phrase. It was informative and literary with a belletristic supplement called Ben <sup>c</sup>Ammi. It was nationalist but not Zionist.

There is also the miscellany Ha-Pardes edited and published by I.H. Rawnitzki in Odessa during the years 1892-96. Although only three volumes of it appeared, yet its role in the development of Hebrew literature was great. It was the literary centre for the Odessan Hebrew writers. In it Bialik made his first appearance in Hebrew literature.

The annual Luah Ahiasaf was published regularly in Warsaw during the years 1893-1905, and after a long interruption, the last volume appeared in 1923. It was edited by several writers, among them Ben-Avigdor, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Klausner, Brainin and Lilienblum. It was mainly literary, with belles lettres occupying the central place, but this policy differed from one editor to another.

## CHAPTER II

### HA-SHILOAH IN THE FIRST PERIOD (1896-1902)

#### 1. THE FOUNDATION OF HA-SHILOAH

In 1896 the situation of Hebrew periodicals in Europe was poor. The leading periodical of the decade Ha-Mé'is had been abandoned after the death of its editor Zederbaum and no other periodical of serious influence was in existence. In that year, however, occurred an event which was wholly to change the position.

K.Z. Wissotzky, at the suggestion of S. Dubnow and Mendele Mokher Seforim, allocated 5,000 roubles as a capital fund in order to finance the first year of a new Hebrew monthly. He laid down the conditions that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am should be its editor and that it should be published in Warsaw. If the cost of obtaining the permit was less than 2,000 roubles, he would decrease his donation to 4,000 roubles.<sup>(1)</sup> This proved to be the case. The monthly was published outside Russia and no money was spent on the permit; one may therefore assume that the sum paid by Wissotzky was only 4,000 roubles.<sup>(2)</sup> The money was deposited with a banker in Odessa; S. Barbash.<sup>(3)</sup> Barbash had offered to participate in the

---

(1) 'Arkhiyon A.H./1016

(2) This conclusion is based on a similar assumption by Ben-Avigdor in a letter to A. Kaminka in Genazim ii, 81; and by Israel Klausner in Ha-tenu<sup>c</sup>ah le-Zion be-Rusiyah, vol. iii, 1965, p.387.

(3) Shohetmann, B.: "Ha-Shiloah", Gilyonot, vol. xxi, 1947, p.104.

project by paying one quarter of the expenses, but his offer was not accepted by Wissotzky.<sup>(4)</sup>

Kalonymus Ze'ev Wissotzky (1824-1904) was born in the province of Kovno, and in 1858 had moved to Moscow where he established the well-known tea firm. He became a wealthy man and took an interest in public affairs by subsidizing charitable institutions and causes. He was one of the earliest adherents and supporters of the *Hibbat Zion* movement in Russia. Under the influence of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am he donated 20,000 roubles for the publication of a Hebrew encyclopaedia for Jewish studies in 1894. When that project was cancelled the money was given to the Society for the Promotion of *Haskalah* in Russia. It was Wissotzky's love for Hebrew and his respect for Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am that made him offer this substantial sum of money for subsidizing the publication of a Hebrew monthly in 1896. J. Zeitlin, his son-in-law had, it is true, raised the question of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's attitude towards religion. Wissotzky accordingly wrote to the editor-designate expressing his hope that Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am would do his best to combine Jewish culture and tradition with European wisdom and enlightenment.<sup>(5)</sup>

Wissotzky's offer had coincided with a change in the private affairs of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. In about 1896 he lost all his fortune. The owners of *Aḥiasaf* in Warsaw were

---

(4) 'Arkhiyon A.H./926/3.3.1896.

(5) Klausner, I., op.cit., vol. iii, p.387.



his friends, and they proposed that he should become manager of their undertaking. He accepted the proposal and settled in Warsaw to take over both the management of *Ahiasaf* and the editorship of Luah Ahiasaf for the year 1896.

The terms of the agreement between *Ahiasaf* and Wissotzky, according to a copy in the archives of *Ahad Ha-Cam*<sup>(6)</sup> were:

1. *Ahiasaf* Co. in Warsaw should be the administrator of all the monthly's affairs in Russia: it would distribute it, print all the necessary advertisements and conduct the distribution with diligence and vigorous precision.
2. The company would receive 20% of the fixed price for the periodical from the fees of all the subscribers that ~~were~~ collected by it or its agents. If the price of the periodical would be six roubles a year, the company would pay to the account of the periodical only 4.80 roubles for each copy.
3. The company would employ agents everywhere and pay them not less than 15% of the fixed price of the periodical, out of the 20% defined in the previous section.
4. The expenses for the postage of issues, for printing special advertisements in other periodicals and for fees to the censor in Warsaw - would be on the account of the periodical; other expenses would be on the account of the company.

---

(6) 'Arkhiyon A.H./1016.

5. *Ahiasaf* would set aside the money which it would receive on the account of the periodical, and at the end of every month it would send to the editor in Berlin a detailed bill of income and expenses during the month, plus the amount of money which <sup>was</sup> is due.

6. The company would not receive more than 5% of the fixed price for the copies which were sold by the editorial office or its agents. The editorial office had the authority to employ volunteer agents everywhere.

7. The company would not receive anything for copies which would be sent free by the editorial office.

8. In case of any obstacles which might affect the publication of the periodical, or if it moved from one city to another, or from one country to another the company would have no right to claim any compensation.

For *Ahad Ha-Cam* this moment offered a chance to fulfil one of his cherished ambitions. By profession he was a businessman and as he liked to call himself "a guest in the temple of literature". But he was very anxious to leave his business and to become a permanent resident in that temple. In 1889 he had edited a literary miscellany called Kaveret which did not, however, bear his name as editor and publisher. In 1893 he wrote from London to I.H. Rawnitzki expressing his wish to take over the editorship of Ha-Mélish. After the death of Zederbaum there were attempts to resume the

publication of the paper. One of these attempts was by prominent members of the Odessa community which aimed at buying the paper and appointing Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as its editor.<sup>(7)</sup> This idea did not succeed because he wanted Ha-Melis to be transferred to Odessa and its owners to renew its permit before selling it. Neither condition was accepted.

In the same year Ahiasaf and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am offered to buy the permit from the owners of the Hebrew monthly Ha-Boqer <sup>Or</sup> because of the difficulty in obtaining a new permit, but again with no success. Afterwards Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am informed Rawnitzki that he was about to become an editor, from the beginning of April 1894 of a Hebrew monthly in Paris (although the circular in his archives shows that what he had in mind was a fortnightly.)<sup>(8)</sup> He wrote: "Ahiasaf and I will establish a Hebrew monthly in Paris. I will be editor and monitor of the print, and they will be responsible for distribution in Russia."<sup>(9)</sup> The name Mi-Mizrah umi-Ma<sup>c</sup>arav was chosen as its name, and Paris was chosen as the place of publication because of the difficulty in obtaining permits for Hebrew periodicals in Russia. Five previous requests were turned down by the censorship. Moreover, Ben-Avigdor, who was a director of Ahiasaf, would not agree to its

---

(7) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.55.

(8) 'Arkhiyon A.H./1016.

(9) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.61.

publication in Vienna for fear that it would give the impression that the new periodical was a continuation of Ha-Shahar.<sup>(10)</sup>

After making all the necessary literary and administrative arrangements the project was called off because in the same year (1894) Brainin published a monthly under the same name despite his promise to Ahiasaf that he would not give his monthly that name.<sup>(11)</sup> Nevertheless, they did not give up the hope that one day Brainin's monthly would cease publication and that they would be in a position to carry out their plans:

"In the future when his monthly will cease publication (this day is, no doubt, very near) we would be able to start with confidence, and even if his monthly were to continue, which is very doubtful, we will be able to start our project; but now both Brainin and others will consider us rivals to his work which is not an honour either for you or for us."<sup>(12)</sup>

Soon afterwards, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am thought of editing and publishing a Hebrew miscellany in Berlin and suggested to Ahiasaf that they could undertake responsibility for its distribution in Russia. The publication of issues was meant to be regular but not at definite intervals. At least six issues would appear every year, these issues would be of seven quires each, every six issues would make one volume; the subscription fees would be 3.50 roubles for each volume.<sup>(13)</sup> In this way Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am

---

(10) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I/26.9.1894

(11) Ibid., 23.1.1894.

(12) Ibid., 24.4.1894.

(13) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.62.

wanted to test the reading public and the ability of his contemporary writers to supply him with enough material before starting any project. This idea too was not successful because of *Ahiasaf's* reluctance to share the responsibility of a periodical with a programme of the kind suggested by *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am*.

Wissotzky's offer had wholly altered the situation. It gave the editor of the new periodical a degree of financial support which would enable him to act with independence:

"If three years earlier he had been eager to succeed Zederbaum as editor of *Ha-Melis*, the prospect of editing a monthly journal, which he would be able to fashion from the outset in accordance with his own ideas and standards and which would have no concern with the trivialities of the daily press, must have appeared even more attractive." (14)

On account of the strict censorship in Czarist Russia it was impossible to publish in Russia a monthly of the type which *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* wanted. Therefore Berlin was chosen as the headquarters for the project, but only until it would be possible to obtain a permit for publishing it in Russia. Apart from this, there were other reasons for having the paper published in Berlin. First, Wissotzky had announced that the paper would appear in Berlin and the editor could not alter this plan without his permission; secondly, the editor suspected that it would be more difficult to get the paper into Russia if it were printed in Cracow (in Austria)

---

(14) Simon, L.: *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am*, Biography, 1960, p.130.

as some had suggested.<sup>(15)</sup> The cost of printing in Berlin was 50 marks per quire for the composition and printing,<sup>(16)</sup> while in Cracow, the cost was about 13 marks less per quire. Nevertheless Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am hesitated to make Cracow the centre of his work.<sup>(17)</sup> In this he followed the advice of Ahiasaf which was against publishing the monthly in Cracow for fear of problems with the censorship, although Zeitlin had been in favour of publishing it in Cracow in the hope that there it would attract more readers in addition to the economy in expenses.<sup>(18)</sup>

After much thought Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am named the monthly Ha-Shiloah after the small river in Palestine "whose waters go softly."<sup>(19)</sup> The choice of the name was not accidental, because there were other names under consideration. "The paper will be called Ha-Shiloah, because I have finally realized that it is the most suitable of all the names which have occurred to my mind."<sup>(20)</sup> The name was symbolic of his desire for the gradual development of Hebrew literature and good literary taste. His idea was to create a Hebrew monthly which would be similar in its literary standard to the

---

(15) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.105.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ibid., p.102.

(18) 'Arkhiyon A.H./833/27.8.1896.

(19) Isaiah 8:6.

(20) 'Iggerot A.H., vol i, p.117.

most important European monthlies like the English Contemporary Review or the French Revue des Deux Mondes. There were other Hebrew periodicals of importance, but there was not, in 1896, a single Hebrew monthly of any note in existence. Several attempts were made to publish Hebrew monthlies, but none of them had succeeded. All the periodicals which had been intended to be monthlies had either suspended publication prematurely or were forced to appear irregularly.

The next step was to obtain the co-operation of a large number of contemporary Hebrew writers. He composed a circular which was dispatched by Ahiasaf to all the important writers of that time. It was followed by private letters from Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to the best writers known to him urging them to write for Ha-Shiloah.

The final step in the preparation for the publication of Ha-Shiloah was to announce to the Hebrew reading public all that they required to know about the monthly and to ask for their help in carrying out this idea by subscribing to it. This announcement was published in contemporary periodicals. The central points in this announcement were:

1. Ha-Shiloah would appear at the end of every month.
2. The year of Ha-Shiloah would be from October to September.
3. Each issue of Ha-Shiloah would be not less than six quires of the size of a large octave.

4. At the end of every six months there would be a title page and a table of contents for the six issues so that twelve issues would form two big volumes with serial numbers for each volume.
5. The subscription fees would be paid in advance to the administration in Russia - to *Ahiasaf* or its agents.
6. Subscribers would always receive Ha-Shiloah through the post directly from the administration.
7. No sample issues would be sent to anyone, but a prospectus would be sent free to anyone who asked for it.
8. Subscription fees would be six roubles for a year, three roubles for a half year and 1.50 rouble for a quarter.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, who was living in Berlin during the first year of the publication was responsible for the distribution outside Russia, <sup>(21)</sup> while *Ahiasaf* was responsible for the distribution inside Russia. Because the censorship in Russia was very severe, the issues were passed to *Ahiasaf* in Warsaw. They would then be examined and permitted to come into Russia by the censor before being sent to subscribers. For this reason the editor made an arrangement with I. Landau, the chief censor in St. Petersburg. According to this, Landau would receive a sum of money for passing the first issue without any obstacles in order to encourage readers to subscribe to it;

---

(21) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.232.



and subsequently he would receive a certain amount of money for each issue.<sup>(22)</sup> The censor in Warsaw too was paid regularly a total of one hundred roubles a year by Ahiasaf in order to pass Ha-Shiloah without raising any problems.<sup>(23)</sup>

Despite all these precautions, the editor was very circumspect in choosing the material to be published in Ha-Shiloah. He used to send any suspect material to the censor before printing it or at the proof stage<sup>(24)</sup> to obtain his approval; in this way he would avoid the disqualification of the issues or delay in sending them to the subscribers. The instructions which he received from the chief censor were:<sup>(25)</sup>

1. There must be no criticism of Christianity and the Fathers of the Church, or attacks on the sanctity of the Bible, both Old and New Testament.
2. There should be no articles against the Empire or against the monarchy, and the periodical should not include any socialist or communist ideas.
3. There should not be anything which would conflict with good morals, modesty etc.
4. There should not be any hint of personal blemishes such as theft, robbery, adultery or prostitution, etc. in the contributions.

---

(22) Ibid., p.218.

(23) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I/9.11.1896.

(24) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.114.

(25) 'Arkhiyon A.H./9.10.1896.

The system of honoraria for the contributors was adopted from that followed by most European periodicals. There was a fixed rate for each page of prose or stanza of poetry whoever the writer was. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am insisted on a unified rate whether the contributor was a prominent writer or a beginner because the value of the material should be determined by the benefit which it would bring to the periodical by attracting the interest of a wider range of readers.<sup>(26)</sup> According to this criterion, the honorarium was 30 roubles for each quire of prose and 0,10 roubles for each stanza of poetry.<sup>(27)</sup> There were writers who did not accept any payment for their contributions to Ha-Shiloah. For them the editor established an "alms box" where he used to put their honoraria for the benefit of poor writers.<sup>(28)</sup> On the other hand, there were other writers who expected to be paid more for their contributions. This is reflected in the following letter to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am by Rawnitzki: "Did you really think that Mendele would be content with thirty roubles per quire like other writers? Do you know how much he expected to receive? one hundred roubles!"<sup>(30)</sup> Each issue was to be sent free to all the contributors who participated in it.<sup>(31)</sup> Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am refused to send Ha-Shiloah to anybody who had not asked for it, no matter who he might be; he considered that that would be an insult to Hebrew literature.

(26) Shohetmann, B.: "Me-'arkhiyone shel A.H.". He-<sup>c</sup>Avar iii, 1955, p.143

(27) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. vi, p.204.

(28) Ibid., vol. iii, p.119.

(29) 'Arkhiyon A.H./926/3.2.1897.

(30) Simon, L.: op.cit., p.145.

(31) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.102.

The editor insisted on punctuality in order to ensure that each issue would be in the hands of readers by the end of every month. It had to be sent from Warsaw (to the subscribers) not later than the 20th day in each month. It would take ten days from the time of sending the issue from Berlin before reaching Warsaw. There it would be examined by the censor before reaching *Ahiasaf*. To make this possible the issue had to be sent from Berlin on the 10th day of each month. For this reason the last material for publication should reach him not later than the 22nd day of the previous month. (32)

The first issue of Ha-Shiloah appeared in *Marheshvan* (October) 1896; it was 23 x 16 cm. in size and extended over 100 pages. The colour of the wrapper was dark green and this remained characteristic of Ha-Shiloah until its very last number. The wrapper was used on both sides for literary announcements such as a list of new published books or any news concerning Ha-Shiloah which the readers might need to know. The layout of the issue was handsome. All the articles except the editorial manifesto and the poetry, were printed in small letters. For the sake of economy the editor would not start every item on a fresh page and thus the articles were printed continuously. The issues were given serial numbers. The title page was printed in Hebrew on one side and in German on the other. The table of contents was arranged alphabetically according to the titles of contributions.

---

(32) Ibid., p.280.

## 2. EDITORIAL POLICY

This attempt to publish a moderate and serious Hebrew monthly was different from all previous ventures of this nature for two reasons. In the first place its financial well-being was guaranteed by Wissotzky who had donated the capital resources for its publication and by Ahiasaf, the administrator of the periodical in Russia. In the second place its editor Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was already a towering figure in cultural Jewish affairs.

Today Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am is strongly forgotten in accounts of Hebrew literature. But eighty years ago he played a decisive role in both the literary and political fields, dominating the former and wielding considerable influence in the latter. His views were greeted with widespread affection and respect, and his house was the meeting-place of the outstanding Hebrew writers and political figures of the time. Nowadays critics tend to pay more regard to the opinions of his opponents in the literary field like Berdyczewski and Brenner.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's influence at the turn of the century is well analysed by Y. Kaufmann:

"The influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was entirely different from that of the *Haskalah* writers who introduced certain dogma which was already known in the world as new social laws, into the laws of Judaism and tried to influence it by means of the power of this dogma which was not their own. They were activists and for this reason they became influential. On the other hand, the generation of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am saw him as teacher, the founder of new doctrine and a continuator of the chain of Jewish philosophers. His generation regarded him as a man of original

thought, an inventor and instructor. That generation was indeed right in its feeling towards him, for Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am had in fact introduced new doctrine. Those who now find in his writings things which are 'known to everyone' do not realize that these things were an innovation by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and then became known to everyone. What made Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am different from others was that his generation had 'digested' the elements of his doctrine in an extraordinary quick way. What was indispensable and constructive in his doctrine was immediately absorbed into the national philosophy and its origin was forgotten. The swiftness of the growth of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's influence led to his being forgotten with equal rapidity."(1)

Asher Zvi Ginzberg was born of *Hasidic* parents on the 18th August 1856 in the townlet of Skvira not far from Kiev in Russia. By the age of fifteen his intellectual development was complete for he had a private tutor to teach him *Talmud*. When he was sixteen he married. From that time onwards he devoted himself largely to non-Jewish studies, especially European languages and literatures. He mastered Russian and German and read whatever came to his hands in the literature of both languages. Later he became more selective in his reading. He concentrated on humanistic subjects, especially history, literature, Philosophy and Sociology. He was much influenced by English moralists and empirical philosophers through German translations - it was only in his thirties that he learned English and French. His reading of belles

---

(1) Kaufmann, Y.: "<sup>C</sup>Iqqaré De<sup>C</sup>otaw shel Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am", Ha-Tequfah xxiv, 1928, p.424.

lettres did not go beyond a few classical writers like Schiller and Goethe.

At the age of twenty-two Ginzberg paid his first visit to Warsaw which, at that time, was one of the principal centres of the *Haskalah* movement. In the same year, 1878, he also visited Odessa for the first time. He returned to Odessa in the following year in order to study the subjects covered by the high-school curriculum and to qualify himself for a university education; but soon he abandoned the idea of matriculation at a Russian university. For several reasons this was delayed until 1882 when he went to Vienna for the second time to examine the prospects. After three weeks, however, he returned home defeated by his lack of self-confidence. During the following year or two he went to Breslau, Berlin, Vienna and Leipzig in search of a university education but none of these efforts brought him closer to his desire. Finally he gave up and decided to remain a self-taught man. His depression is reflected bitterly in his reminiscences. He describes his feelings in his own words:

"Those years were the worst of my life. The unending struggle from within and without, the advances and retreats, my hatred of the conditions in which I lived and my inability to carve out for myself a path suited to my character and way of thinking - all this overwhelmed me, embittered my life and plunged me into the depths of misery. I had no peace of mind by day or by night. I went about like a ghost, wrapped in my thoughts and imaginings, with nobody to whom I could pour out my heart, nobody who might help me in any way of my perplexity!"(2)

In 1884 he stayed in Odessa with his family for a few months and there he was persuaded to take an active role in the *Hibbat Zion* movement. He became a member of the Central committee of the movement, which was set up in 1884 under the presidency of Leo Pinsker. For private reasons he returned to his village after some months and stayed there two more years until 1886.

To his intensive study of the *Talmud* and *Rabbinic* literature Ginzberg had added a thorough knowledge of mediaeval Jewish philosophy and literature. He studied the Hebrew and German works of pioneers of the "Science of Judaism" and the application of modern methods of inquiry and research to the study of the Jewish culture. He had studied the positivism of Comte as presented by Russian thinkers like Pisarev and the metaphysical and ethical ideas of English moralists and the English empirical philosophers such as John Locke, David Hume, John Stuart Mill, Thomas Carlyle and Herbert Spencer. He also studied French psychological sociologists like Taine, Paulhan and others.

In his reminiscences Asher Ginzberg reveals how he became *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am*:

"In 1889 I suddenly and accidentally became a Hebrew writer... During the middle days of Tabernacles the *Maskilim* of Odessa had a meeting at which they decided to compose an address in honour of the well-known scholar, S.J. Fuenn who was about to celebrate his Jubilee. Some of the Odessa Hebraists produced different versions and I also tried my hand. My attempt was the most successful of all, and Ben-David, the correspondent of Ha-Mélish, thought fit to publish it in the

paper with my name on it. A short time afterwards when a wretched quarrel broke out between Zederbaum and Gordon, the Odessa *Maskilim* decided to publish a protest against both of them for bringing Hebrew literature into contempt, and they entrusted me with the drafting of the protest. What I wrote was printed in *Ha-Maggid* over the signatures of a large number of Odessa *Maskilim* and it pleased the reading public. It was due to these two incidents that when Zederbaum came to Odessa about that time the local Hebraists urged him to get hold of me. He laid ~~si~~ge to me and would not let me go until I promised to write an article for *Ha-Mélis* ... It was thus that I wrote my first article "*Lo' zeh ha-derekh*"... The article appeared in *Ha-Mélis* on 15th March 1889, over the signature of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. The idea of this pen-name was to make it clear that I was not a writer and had no intention of becoming one; I was just expressing incidentally my opinion on the subject about which I wrote as one of the people, interested in his people's affairs." (3)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's policy as editor of the new periodical was the result of his training and his experience:

"For those who are familiar with the writings of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am it will not come as a surprise to know that he succeeded in describing the spiritual image of Maimonides in the likeness of Asher Ginzberg. One may say that the reason for the success of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am in his role as 'Guide to the Perplexed' was the fact that he had submitted completely to the spirit of Western Europe in spite of being Eastern European in his spiritual roots." (4)

Indeed in his *Essay "Mosheh"* Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am describes the nature of the prophet as the one who

"remains in the wilderness, buries his own generation and trains up a new generation. During year after year of unwearying devotion he teaches this younger generation the laws of

---

(3) *Kitve A.H.*, p.469.

(4) *Kurzweil, B.; Sitrutinu ha-hadashah-hemshekh u-mahapelshah*, p.197.



justice which they are to put on the statute-book in their future policy. At the same time, he constantly keeps alive the memory of the great past in which the laws were formulated. Past and future are the whole content of the prophet's life, each complementing the other."(5)

There is no doubt that this description contains an autobiographical allusion by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am.(6)

The style and the logical argument in Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's essays were something new in this field of writing.

"The significance and value of his objective philosophy could not be fully appreciated without taking into consideration the spiritual situation which Hebrew literature had reached at the end of the 19th century. His essays were an attempt to provide an active stimulus beyond this situation, the situation of being at the crossroads, which the progressive intellectuals of Eastern Europe of his generation had reached by abrogating complete religious belief. One must know the public to which Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was addressing himself in order to arrive at a correct assessment of the value of his philosophy. Both writers and readers of secular Hebrew literature of that time were standing at the crossroads."(7)

He reviewed all contemporary events in Jewry from a philosophic watchtower educating a whole generation through his penetrating gravity of thought and his perfection of form.

Equally important is the fact that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was considered by some other critics as rejectionist because he did not regard Yiddish language and literature as part of Jewish culture. Dubnow accused Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am of "being out of tune with the entire spiritual

---

(5) Kitve A.H., p.346.

(6) Wolfovski, M.Z.: Qerovim be nefesh, 1868, p.13.

(7) Kurzweil, op.cit., p.194.

and historical development of Judaism." After all, the Apocrypha was written in Greek, the *Talmud* in Aramaic, the works of Jewish philosophers in the Middle Ages in Arabic and the writings of modern Jewish scholars in various other languages.<sup>(8)</sup> Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's insistence that Hebrew literature should be concerned only with Jewish matters does not mean that he was against its being influenced by European literatures. This was not to be expected from the man who could be regarded as the most 'European' Hebrew writer of his contemporaries. There is hardly any of his essays which is not based entirely on European thought. He always examines ideas genetically by seeking to reveal their historical, psychological and social roots.

The philosophy of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and his methods of discussion came under criticism too.

"As a writer he was not creative but thinker and philosopher. In other words, he observes life and the world, society and humanity from a single intellectual spiritual point of view. He does not produce thoughts but rather discusses them. He discusses a matter whether it is good or bad, whether it will bring profit or loss. He does not like to uproot a plant but rather to remove the thorns and briars which surround it and prevent its growth."<sup>(9)</sup>

It is true to some extent that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was a pedant and sceptic and this might be considered as a sign of impotence. "He was realistic to the extent that he could not be revolutionary in his thoughts. He used

---

(8) Fraenkel, Dubnow, Herzl and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am;  
London, 1963, p.30.

(9) Berdyczewski, M.J.: Ma'amarim, p.99.

to over-estimate the obstacles and to lay much stress on realism in life."<sup>(10)</sup>

In the political field Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am's philosophy met with greater opposition despite the great number of his followers. In 1897 after the first Zionist Congress had met at Basle, Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am was quoted as saying: "Salvation will come from the prophets and not from the diplomats." He included himself among the prophets and Herzl among the diplomats.<sup>(11)</sup> He was one of the few who devoted themselves entirely to the national idea but his nationalism was different from that of Herzl and Max Nordau. To Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am the establishment of a single institution of higher learning in Palestine was of greater importance than a hundred agricultural settlements, an attitude that some considered to be fanaticism. "His problem is that he always produces a new thought, a great idea. But when he sees it growing and taking a concrete shape he finds himself compelled to fight over it until he destroys it."<sup>(12)</sup>

On the other hand others saw Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am differently. Bialik declared: "He is a man of theory, theory that could be carried into practice. His style is influential, especially because of its feasibility and its realism"<sup>(13)</sup> J. Tahon too, a major critic of Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am's literary views, shared Bialik's opinion.

---

(10) Klausner, J: Yasrim u-vonim, vol. ii, p.20.

(11) Fraenkel; op.cit., p.28.

(12) Frischmann, D.: Ketavim, vol. iv, p.99.

(13) Bialik: Devarim she-beCal peh, vol. ii, p.195.

"Anyone", he declared, "who would describe Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am only as critical and contradictory but not as creative, is mistaken, and deceives the reader intentionally or unintentionally. Our generation is not helpless as long as Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am lives among us. He stands high as a citadel of strength while we look at him with the fear of love and the love of fear."(14)

Despite all this respect Tahon echoed the views of Berdy<sup>C</sup>zewski when he said:

"Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's main function was not to create anything new but rather to articulate the innovations of others. He used to guide and not to push. Instead of building something new he used to improve what others had built or started to build. He did not give orders but warnings. He was not a commander but a teacher. We appreciate this precious man, we respect him and love him deeply and sincerely - but we cannot follow in his footsteps."(15)

The reason for this unlimited love even from his opponents lay in the nature of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. He distinguished between personal relationships and the clash of opinions. He never involved himself in a personal argument. He criticized ideas rather than people.

This biographical discussion may help towards understanding the policy of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am in editing Ha-Shiloah. The policy was outlined in a long article at the beginning of the first issue.<sup>(16)</sup> In this article Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am seemed to have changed his attitude concerning ways of developing Hebrew language and literature.

(14) Tahon, J.: "Lo'Zeh ha-derekh", Ha-Shiloah xxx, 211.

(15) Ibid., p.214.

(16) "Te'udat Ha-Shiloah", Ha-Shiloah i, pp.1-6 (see Appendix I below).

Only two years previously he had stated:

"If you want to develop literature you must bring to it lively concepts, bring them as you can, comfortably or with difficulty, in philosophical or literary form, only do not change an iota in them."(17)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am meant that Hebrew literature must be opened to the influence of European culture. Now that he was given the opportunity to help in this development he had altered his approach. He did not allow any non-Jewish aspects to be discussed in the monthly or even a translation of material that was not related to Judaism. He justified this attitude by declaring that

"Hebrew translation is nothing but a foreign food on a Hebrew plate; it is not sufficient for us simply to import foreign material. We should first of all, adapt and assimilate it to our national genius."(18)

In another place he wrote:

"If those who made the Greek Septuagint translation of the Bible for Egyptian Jews had at the same time translated Plato into Hebrew for the Jews of Palestine, thus familiarizing our people with the Greek spirit in its own land and through the medium of its own language, it is highly probable that a similar process of translation from self-effacing to competitive imitation would have taken place in Palestine - but on an even higher plane and with consequences even more important for the development of Jewish spirit."(19)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wanted to give his readers "suitable spiritual nourishment and matters which they need to know

---

(17) Kitve A.H., p.97.

(18) Ibid., p.133.

(19) Ibid., p.88.

in order to repair their breaches and to rebuild their ruins."(20)

"In this respect only a monthly which is not under the pressure of time will have the power to penetrate gradually into the secret places of our life, to collect slowly 'their keys' scattered in terms of time and place, to explain every phenomenon and every problem from all its different aspects and to bring us nearer to the desired end: to know ourselves, to understand our life and to establish our future wisely."(21)

This article reflected the desire of the editor to concentrate only on Jewish matters and to pay less attention to the human and universal aspect of culture. In his opinion the aim of literature should be

"to teach us how to know our inner world: the course of development of our people in all periods, the ways of revealing its spirit in all branches of life, its spiritual and physical position in all countries at this time, and the open as well as the latent connections between all these and the phenomena that appear in the life of the surrounding nations and the rules which control the life of mankind and society in general."(22)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wanted to edit his monthly according to the highest standards of European culture and on the basis of Jewish traditional ideals, that is to say, Jewish content in European form. Ha-Shiloah, he emphasised, was not intended for a particular section of the reading public but for the masses; and it would not serve the writers as a medium for their scientific discussions and debates on abstract problems.

---

(20) Ha-Shiloah i, 1.

(21) Ibid., p.3.

(22) Ibid., p.2.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am classified the material to be published in Ha-Shiloah into four categories:

- "Articles on science": which will give correct concepts of various distinguished phenomena attributed to the life of the Jews and their spiritual development from ancient times to the present day, as well as articles on general science insofar as they are concerned with Judaism and light the darkness in various corners of our life and our history.

- "Publicistics": which would include articles dealing with the intellectual, moral, economic and political etc. situation of our people now in all countries. It would attempt to give adequate explanation for all good and bad phenomena as they are, the reasons and the consequences, and to show as far as possible also methods of change and improvement.

- "Criticism": which means judging the human spirit and the result of its work in relation to the truth (logical criticism) to goodness (moral criticism) and to beauty (aesthetic criticism). The section would cover not only new books, but also all ideas and actions, new as well as old, which made or are making or can make an impression on the life of the people and the course of its development. This should and must be examined either from the three aspects mentioned simultaneously, or from one or two aspects according to the subject.

- "Belles lettres": which would include good stories from the past and present life of our people that give a faithful picture of our position in various periods and places or admit a ray of light on some of the dark corners of our 'inner world'. However, beautiful works which do not offer more than their beauty, which stimulate emotional feelings only for pleasure, will have no place in Ha-Shiloah because in our present situation, we think that our literature should not disperse its small resources on such matters. Mere poetry, lyrical effusion on the beauty of nature and the delights of love and so forth - our youth can seek from other languages where they will find enough. For this reason poems will be small in number. (23)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, who admitted that he had no appreciation for belles lettres, may have wished to exclude it entirely from his programme,

"but that would not have been tolerated even from Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am by a reading public which had been taught to look upon belles lettres as synonymous with literature. So he did not place an absolute bar on poetry and short stories, but severely limited the space allotted to them, and restricted their writers to subjects drawn from Jewish life." (24)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am finished his article with a firm statement that he would not change his policy under any circumstances:

---

(23) "Te<sup>C</sup>udat Ha-Shiloah", Ha-Shiloah i, 3-5.

(24) Simon, L., op.cit., p.134.



"whether this way will satisfy our readers or not - in any case it is better that they should know in advance that it will be the way of Ha-Shiloah so that it may be judged in these circumstances according to its way."

By stressing his desire not to make Ha-Shiloah the organ of any section of the public Ahad Ha-CAm enabled himself to seek and obtain the collaboration of a wider range of writers than would have been available for a periodical with a party label. It also enabled him to criticize the Hebbat Zion movement of which he was a prominent member. He thus assured both writers and readers that his monthly was to be a free platform for all views that were expressed "with knowledge and sincerity, but not for the sake of provocation."

3. THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN AHAD HA-CAM AND THE  
'YOUNG WRITERS'

Readers and critics gave the first issue of Ha-Shiloah a mixed reception. Many welcomed it and considered it a great step forward towards the modernization of Hebrew literature; others saw it as a step towards the limitation of the Hebrew reader's knowledge. Everyone, however, agreed that a Hebrew periodical of that type would not satisfy a wide range of readers, and it was unlikely that it would survive long. The editor himself wrote once:

"Concerning the first issue I have a wide collection of opinions from the reading public. The moral I draw from them is that I should pay no heed to anybody's opinion, but just act according to my own convictions. Every single article is both condemned outright and praised up to the skies; what one critic likes best another dislikes most heartily, and vice versa."(1)

One of the few critics who welcomed the publication of Ha-Shiloah was that of the Jewish Chronicle. He wrote:

"Another attempt is being made to establish a monthly written in Hebrew in a German-speaking country. The editor A. Ginzberg is a sanguine man if he expects a long life for Ha-Shiloah. Hebrew periodicals of this type do not seem to have a large public. Certainly the present effort is a good one. The articles are well written, they are varied and cover much heterogeneous ground... But I cannot honestly say that the new monthly looks as if it had come to stay. No one, however, would be more pleased than I if I prove a false prophet."(2)

---

(1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.159.

(2) Jewish Chronicle, November 20, 1896.

On the other hand Berdyczewski was one of those who criticized the policy of the new monthly. He expressed his opinion in "An open letter to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am" in which he protested against the editor's limitation of the scope of literature in Ha-Shiloah. He wrote:

"Allow me, honourable writer, to tell you that I myself, consider this 'foundation' which you have laid for establishing the spiritual needs of our periodical literature only on Jewishness and what is attributed to Judaism as a kind of decline towards a narrow path. I did not expect this from you because of the broad point of view which characterized you heretofore." (3)

Berdyczewski wanted European culture to be made available for the use of every Hebrew reader, and he accused Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am of confusing the young readers and therefore driving them away from Hebrew literature:

"By dividing life into two territories, ours and what belongs to our neighbours, we are widening the innermost division in the hearts of our young generation... You yourself are causing a separation between nationalism and humanity by building our literature on Jewish basis while leaving the human aspect of culture to other literatures. You have come to build, to mend the tears, and the water of Ha-Shiloah desires to divide the heart of every Jew into two separate compartments: a Jewish compartment and a human one." (4)

Berdyczewski described Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am as a thinker who underestimated the importance of poetry in the life of mankind. He criticized the editor's decision regarding the number of poems in his monthly:

---

(3) Berdyczewski, M.J.: "<sup>C</sup>Al parashat Derakhim - Mikhtav Galuy 'el A.H.", Ha-Shiloah, i, 155.

(4) Ibid.

"This preference in the monthly which comes to pave a way and act as a guide, is something which in my opinion will mislead hearts about poetry and its great value in our life. Therefore forgive me for allowing myself to tell you in this respect that I consider you as being over-inclined to one side, the side of your personal view."(5)

Berdyczewski claimed to be speaking on behalf of the young people of his generation:

"As one of the young men of that generation who knows more or less what is in their minds and hearts, their ambitions and their aspirations, I think that according to 'their minds and hearts' I ought to tell you today: the place is too narrow for us... Narrow for our spiritual needs and for the feelings which fill all our hearts."(6)

He called for a radical change in Hebrew literature so that it could satisfy the needs of the younger generation:

"We want to be human beings and Jews simultaneously and in the same breath, and fed from one source. We feel a great and essential need to heal the wide and painful split in our hearts which causes an inner struggle, more difficult than the external struggle. We need to widen our scope and to put human knowledge and its requirements which are changing every day on the same level as our traditional heritage... It is all the same to us whether the water of Ha-Shiloah goes softly or washes away strongly, whether it is quiet or agitated, hot or cold; provided only that it should be enough for us to drink and quench all the thirst - yes, all the thirst - of the present generation... Not only with Jewish matters, but also with other very important matters."(7)

Ahad Ha-Cam's comment on this criticism was very cool and dignified. He wrote:

- 
- (5) Ibid., p.157.  
 (6) Ibid., p.158.  
 (7) Ibid., pp.158-159.

"We all know that our language is now only half a language. It lacks some concepts and expressions, and without these our literature has no hope of becoming a living and general literature. We all know, too, that there are no 'erudite scholars' among contemporary Hebrew writers, who can enrich our literature with substantial and original ideas in any branch of general human knowledge." (8)

He did not deny the importance of general knowledge for Hebrew readers. On the contrary, he admitted that it is essential for them, but more essential is it that they should first know themselves; so the human being in a Jewish image must be the sole concern of Hebrew literature. He also insisted on his statement that general knowledge is available in other languages for all those who may want it. Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am questioned the ability of the writers among his contemporaries to satisfy all the needs of the younger generation in a proper way. He challenged them to help to carry out the programme of Ha-Shiloah with all its limitations:

"They are complaining that the place is too narrow for them while the most important sections in this narrow place are still empty because of the lack of contributors for them... They should come and first carry out the programme of Ha-Shiloah as it is, and if one day the place will be really narrow, only then will it be extended automatically." (9)

The aim of both Ah<sup>ad</sup> Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and Berdyczewski was to create a modern Hebrew literature. They differed only on the ways to achieve this aim. While Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's view was that modern Hebrew literature should be based on

---

(8) Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, "Sorekh wi-yekholet", Ha-Shiloah, i, 271.

(9) Ibid., p.273.

Jewish traditions and Jewish culture Berdyczewski's idea was to create a modern literature based on universal and human knowledge and culture while showing all respect to Jewish culture. The most important difference between them lies in the fact that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am stressed the value of thought for the nation and the importance of literature as an educational medium, while Berdyczewski called for an appreciation of the feelings of the individual and literature for its own sake.

Both the criticism of Berdyczewski and the answer of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am stimulated two trends in the periodical literature of that time. On the side of Berdyczewski were J. Tahon (1880-1950) and M. Ehrenpreis (1869-1951); both expressed in Ha-Shiloah, their opposition to the views of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. Tahon entered the debate with his article "*Sifrut Le'omit*"<sup>(10)</sup> in which he criticized belles lettres for being unrealistic and for ignoring the actual life of the Jews:

"Our contemporary literature does not satisfy even a small part of our great spiritual requirements. Despite all its popularity, our belles lettres are a bowshot's distance from real and full life; they do not touch at all the multitude of questions which fill the heart and mind of a European Jew today; even the lyrical value of this literature is mostly in great doubt."<sup>(11)</sup>

This attitude was very much in line with Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's view on Hebrew literature, but the real purpose of Tahon's article was to criticize the ban on non-Jewish aspects of

---

(10) Ha-Shiloah i, 344-349.

(11) Ibid., p.347.

literature in Ha-Shiloah:

"Our literature must be of Judaeo-European character. Jewish nationalism would be recognized in it primarily in the language in which it is written, furthermore in the special style which characterizes our people, exactly as there is a special literary character and style for every other nation."(12)

He went on to support Berdyczewski's call for widening the scope of literature in Ha-Shiloah:

"It is obvious from my point of view that the programme which the editor of Ha-Shiloah offered us in his manifesto will not satisfy us. In my opinion, this periodical which was established 'for science, literature and current events' lacks a whole section of literature. What Ahad Ha-CAm wants to give us is only a small part of literature."(12)

Ahad Ha-CAm's definition of the aim of Hebrew literature was that it should help the Jew to understand his inner world and that it does not need to be creative to achieve this aim. On the other hand, Tahon's opinion was that:

"This limitation will not give us an opportunity for originality, for original ideas and original literature, and obviously for our spiritual development and perfection"(13)

Unlike Berdyczewski whose reply to Ahad Ha-CAm's invitation to work in Ha-Shiloah was that "the place is too narrow for us", Tahon said:

"The editor is asking Hebrew writers 'to come and work with him as they wish and according to their hearts'. If we are consulted about what we are asking for, we will certainly come and work with him willingly."(14)

---

(12) Ibid., p.348.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid., pp.348-349.

The only comment by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am on this article was a short editorial remark in which he referred the readers to his reply to Berdyczewski's "Open letter". He held that Tahon had not added anything that required further discussion.

Marcus Ehrenpreis was another representative of the 'Young Writers'. In his article,<sup>(15)</sup> he started with a critical survey of different trends in Hebrew literature since the time of *Ha-Meassefim*. He also discussed the different approaches of both the '*Tushiyah*' and '*Ahiasaf*' publishing companies and their attempts to develop the language and literature. '*Ahiasaf*'s policy which was devised by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was to bring into literature only what is related to Jewishness from all sources; but '*Tushiyah*'s policy was for Hebrew literature to pick up as much as possible from European literatures and to introduce it in Hebrew translations to the reading public. But Ehrenpreis did not agree to either of the two approaches, claiming that what the younger generation wanted is a synthesis of both Jewish and human cultures, that is to say, adapting human culture to the Jewish spirit:

"We are completely European in our feelings and in our thoughts; there is no barrier to prevent us any more from reaching the human culture which aspires to a clear understanding... We want to bring the spiritual values of new Europe into the area of our national culture; because this aspiration is essential now for our inner life, it must also be essential for any literary work."<sup>(16)</sup>

---

(15) "Le-'an?", *Ha-Shiloah* i, 489-503.

(16) *Ibid.*, p.499\_\_\_\_\_.



The answer of Ehrenpreis to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's question "you want! You need - but are you capable of satisfying these needs?"<sup>(17)</sup> was clear and definite:

"Yes, we are capable of doing that and we believe in our ability and in our power: When Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am distinguished between 'necessity and ability' he forgot an obvious fact in the history of culture, that ability has never been less than necessity... If spiritual needs are truly natural then limited 'capability' cannot restrain them; on the contrary, needs stimulate capability and expand it to reach the required extent."<sup>(18)</sup>

Ehrenpreis then moved to the main purpose of his article which was to criticize Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's policy in editing Ha-Shiloah. He stated:

"We also believe that slow and gradual development will not lead us to our desired aim. All the great actions in the development of human culture were not taken gradually but through cultural revolutions... That was how new religions and new thoughts were born. That was how new cultures were born... We too need a revolution - a cultural revolution. We cannot go slowly. We are very sick and need urgent treatment. There is a great deal that we must destroy and a complete world, a new world, that we must build."<sup>(19)</sup>

What made Ehrenpreis different from the other two 'Young Writers' was his differentiation between the real needs and the innermost thoughts of any nation, as well as his call for adopting European culture to the Jewish character.

---

(17) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, "Sorekh wi-ykholet", Ha-Shiloah i, 273.

(18) Ehrenpreis, Ha-Shiloah i, 502-503.

(19) Ibid., p.503.

In his comment Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am tried to prove that the conflict between Jewish and general cultures may widen the "painful split in our hearts." The only solution, in his opinion, was to compound both of them into a new and perfect form after adapting foreign ideas to Jewish life. His prediction was:

"This situation, my young friends, will never change even a hairsbreadth by your violent loud shouts, 'the place is too narrow for us!' - 'we are capable' as long as your capability is only in words and not in actions. Therefore allow me to give you some 'good advice': Instead of spending your time conducting investigation on whether necessity stimulates ability or the reverse you should come and satisfy the needs according to the ability... And if your deeds are as great as your words, we shall make room for you at the top generously and with pleasure." (20)

The argument ended at this point for some time until Bernfeld published in Ha-Shiloah (21) an article strongly critical of the Young Writers and their views. His reason for writing this criticism was that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had been left alone in the battle in defence of the old school of Hebrew writers; and since Ha-Shiloah was a free platform for all writers he came to express his views as a representative of the old school. He accused the Young Writers of imitating blindly the views and style of the German Young Writers without even trying to understand the reasons behind their movement.

Bernfeld explained that like all other nations there is no harm in Jews trying to understand the national

(20) "Eṣah tovah", Ha-Shiloah i, 508.

(21) "Heshbonah shel sifruteno", Ha-Shiloah, iii, 31-41.

heritage.

"They say that we are responsible for driving the youth away from our literature because they do not find in it what they want, except studies of ancient Jewish history - and those are considered by our new writers as trifles."(22)

As for the attitude towards belles lettres he argued that, like the Young Writers, he appreciated belles lettres. But this <sup>was</sup> is not a suitable means for quenching the thirst of the Jewish youth because of the lack of Hebrew bellettrists who can express genuinely the feelings of the people, "If, however, you the Young Writers, have the ability you can write what you like; but if you write tasteless stories, it will be you who will cause the disgrace of Jewish literature in the eyes of our youth."(23) Like Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am Bernfeld too ended his article with good advice to the Young Writers:

"It could have been better for our Young Writers to lessen their exaggeration and to show us where they excel, what they are capable of doing for the development and glory of our literature; and if they will produce new, acceptable and substantial work, we will certainly bless them for it and we will pay them the respect which they deserve."(24)

This criticism angered Berdyczewski who sent his protest to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am in a "Letter to the editor".(25) He blamed Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am for allowing Bernfeld to humiliate the Young Writers in this manner by calling them 'false

---

(22) Ibid., p.39.

(23) Ibid., p.40.

(24) Ibid., p.41.

(25) "Mikhtav 'el ha-<sup>C</sup>orekh", Ha-Shiloah, iii, 183-185.

prophets' who spend their time in the 'cafe' discussing trifles. Berdyczewski repeated his claim that his generation could not satisfy its needs by contenting itself with the culture and tradition which had grown old during thousands of years.

"We are a different people now, a new generation with new feelings and new thoughts. A new period has started now in our life and this is enough to make us pioneers of the new trend." (26)

Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am added to the article an editorial remark in which he tried to defend himself for allowing the publication of Bernfeld's criticism. He explained that the latter meant to criticize a movement and not any particular writer. The editor then expressed his own view on the term 'humanity' as presented by Berdyczewski.

"The 'humanity' of this writer is in fact interlarded with the theory of ~~the~~ 'the super-man'. It is full of mysteries which cannot be tolerated by the ordinary mind to the extent that sometimes we read and ask ourselves in astonishment if there is anybody in the world, including the author himself, who could explain their mysteries to us." (27)

Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am was not the only one who criticized Berdyczewski for being over-influenced by the European culture in a very distorted way. Frischmann, too, who was on friendly terms with Berdyczewski, wrote once to the latter:

---

(26) Ibid., p.184.

(27) "He<sup>c</sup>arat ha<sup>c</sup>orekh," Ha-Shiloah iii, 186.

"During the last few years I did not like your habit of stressing in every article which was written by you that you live in the West and that you are Western, eating and drinking according to Western customs." (28)

Berdyczewski understood the editorial remark mentioned above as a kind of support for Bernfeld by the editor. The remark was the subject of a very exhausting correspondence between Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and Berdyczewski which ended in a very dramatic announcement by the latter that he will never contribute to Ha-Shiloah again. (29) Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's reply was that "Ha-Shiloah is the right place for any writer who respects literature and himself. If someone does not find himself obliged to participate in it, I would not urge him to do so." (30)

This controversy did not produce any outright literary benefit or lead to any change in the editorial policy of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am despite all the publicity given to it by the historians of modern Hebrew literature. One may, however, ask whether Berdyczewski and his colleagues really represented the younger generation. This certainly was not the case. Bialik stated in a letter to Berdyczewski (31) that he supported Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's attitude; Feuerberg said:

"This 'young generation' which, like you, has its dreams and is sacrificing itself, passing through the desert in order to make way for a second generation which will be healthy, joyful and invigorated to come to the good earth - this generation itself considers you its most terrible enemy, and it will fight you with all its force and its power." (32)

(28) "'Iggerot Frischmann le-Berdyczewski", Moznayim vii, 1938, p.560.

(29) Berdyczewski: "Mikhtav 'el ha-<sup>c</sup>orekh", Ha-Shiloah iii, 287-288.

(30) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.41.

(31) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.98.

(32) "Mikhtav le-mar Berdyczewski", Kitve M.Z. Feuerberg, p.138.

Another writer of the young generation was D.Z. Probstain who wrote:

"Ehrenpreis and his colleagues speak on behalf of 'the youth who are entering now the temple of our literature'. I am also one of those. As a 'youth who is entering the temple of our literature' I say that the 'necessity and the ability' of our literature today is to teach us how to know ourselves and to understand our position in the world. This recognition is more necessary for us than an acquaintance with the doctrine of Dubois-Raymond or Friedrich Nietzsche."(33)

In dealing with the Young Writers Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am knew how to make a distinction between the editor and the writer in himself, and according to his published letters he continued to have good relations with the three representatives of this group. When Ahiasaf refused to renew the contract with Berdyczewski for conducting its business in Berlin, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote to him: "Our literary dispute does not prevent me, of course, from wishing you a good future and success and from sharing your suffering."(34) On the other hand, when Berdyczewski asked Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to give him a permanent section in Ha-Shiloah the latter's answer was:

"For your suggestion about giving you a permanent section in Ha-Shiloah there is no justification. You know how much I have to work on your articles in order to put them in a form which would conform at least with something of my requirements of taste and logic."(35)

When Berdyczewski decided to republish his works in a collection Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's advice to him was:

---

(33) "Li-she'elat ha-sifrut", Ha-Shiloah ii, 423.

(34) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.91.

(35) Ibid., vol. i, p.277.

"I would like to tell you that it is necessary for you to give your work (even those which were published in dailies and weeklies) to someone who has a perfect knowledge of grammar in order to correct the many mistakes which spoil your style, before you republish them."(36)

It was Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am who persuaded Ahiasaf to accept Berdyczewski as the director of its centre in Berlin. And when Berdyczewski and Ehrenpreis decided to establish a special publishing house for the Young Writers which was to be called 'Ha-tehiyyah' they asked for Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's help. He quickly wrote to Ahiasaf: "We have to do everything possible for them... I very much want us to help them as much as we can... So I am asking you to come to an arrangement with them on easy terms."(37)

Ha-tehiyyah did not come into existence because Berdyczewski announced his withdrawal from the project.(38)

Berdyczewski tried always to give the impression that he disagreed with Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's views on many aspects of Judaism and Jewish culture. It was, however, Berdyczewski who admitted indirectly that he was influenced by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's style and philosophy. In his review of the book '<sup>C</sup>Al parashat Derakhim' he wrote:

"Since I have started reading books, I have never come across language of such good taste although it aroused inside me a strong opposition to many of the thoughts expressed in it... despite the respect which I had in my heart for them. Those thoughts forced me to come to different decisions in the matters under discussion."(39)

It was Berdyczewski too who said once: "This generation will never be orphaned as long as Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am lives in it."(40)

---

(36) Ibid., vol. ii, p.276.

(37) Ibid., p.11.

(38) Ha-Shiloah iii, 288.

(39) Kol Kitve Berdyczewski, vol. ii, p.32.

(40) Fishman, J.: 'Amat ha-binyan', p.195.

#### 4. FINANCIAL MATTERS AND PROBLEMS OF PUBLICATION

After the successful beginning Ahad Ha-CAm felt that for two reasons he had undertaken too much in accepting the post of editor. The first reason was financial, and the second was that he over-estimated his ability to satisfy both his contributors and his subscribers. Here we shall deal with the first aspect, while the second will be discussed in the following section.

Ahad Ha-CAm expected to finance the monthly for a long time with the basic capital fund donated by Wissotzky, but his estimates were made three years earlier when he was preparing for the publication of 'Mi-Mizrah umi-Ma<sup>c</sup>arav'. According to these estimates<sup>(1)</sup> the total cost of publishing 2,000 copies of the paper each month (in 1894) was to be 671 roubles. If the 2,000 copies were sold it would mean a profit of 400 roubles a month before deducting the cost of postage. On the other hand, when Ahad Ha-CAm came to prepare for the publication of Ha-Shiloah he realized that the cost of paper and printing had risen considerably. The cost of publishing 1,000 copies every month was at that time 470 roubles; and even if the 1,000 copies were all sold it will still mean the loss of nearly 200 roubles a month.<sup>(2)</sup> Therefore 4,000 roubles was not enough even to finance the publication of the monthly during its first year.

---

(1) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I

(2) From a letter by A. Druyonow to S. Ben-Zion, Yedi<sup>c</sup>ot Genezim vol. iv, No. 17, 1971, p.638.



One of the reasons for the financial failure of Ha-Shiloah was the division of the administrative work between the editor who lived in Berlin and later in Odessa, and Ahiasaf, the administrators, in Warsaw, and the printer, part of the time in Berlin and part of the time in Cracow. After completing the first volume Ahad Ha-CAm stated in a letter to Rawnitzki:

"The financial side of the business is developing gradually like the waters of Ha-Shiloah ... The subscribers are increasing every day but only in small numbers." (3)

He was convinced that this monthly would not find enough readers quickly. He maintained that "taste had been spoilt completely and hard work, for many years to come, is required in order to improve it." (4)

Ahad Ha-CAm expected that the number of subscribers will be not less than 2,000, and so that number of copies was printed for the first issue. However, the actual number of subscribers for the first volume was put by Ahad Ha-CAm himself at 1500. (5) When he realized that this number had decreased in the second half of the first year to less than 1000 he urged Ahiasaf to be more active and careful in choosing its agents, especially those who did not pay in advance but even delayed the payment of the subscription fees. (6) On the other hand, Ahiasaf

---

(3) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.161.

(4) Ibid., p.192.

(5) Ibid., p.264

(6) Ibid., p.164

claimed that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was responsible for this lack of subscribers because of his anti-Zionist remarks. His answer to this criticism was:

"The reason for this lack of subscribers is the slackness of agents and not my awful remarks... You say that I am destroying the project with my own hands while I and our friends here believe that Ahiasaf is destroying the project by appointing dishonest agents and by managing the affairs without first making the necessary arrangements and acting with energy." (7)

For some reason Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wanted to publish the last two issues of the first volume in a double issue (11 quires instead of 12), but Ahiasaf opposed the idea. They feared that this might make a bad impression on the subscribers who might lose confidence in the monthly if something like this happened to it in the first half of its first year. (8)

Appreciating the difficulty, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am decided not to start working on the second volume until he had obtained the full commitment of Ahiasaf to the responsibility of financing the whole volume whatever the circumstances might be. They agreed. When, however, it came to the fulfilment of their promise, they were unreliable. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had to ask for the help of Wissotzky's son-in-law in order to cover the deficit of 600-800 roubles. (9) He offered to lend Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am 600 roubles to be repaid after four months to enable him to complete the volume. (10)

---

(7) Ibid., p.210.

(8) 'Arkhiyon A.H./83II/5.1.1897

(9) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.240.

(10) 'Arkhiyon A.H./833/22.8.1897.

The volume was completed, and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am expressed his hope that "if the publication of Ha-Shiloah would continue for another year or two it would educate a sufficiently wide public which would enable it in the end to become self-supporting." (11)

After finishing the second volume Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am decided to suspend publication for some time in order to give himself and Ahiasaf a chance to reorganize the work. This interruption was only for three months, from October to December 1897. During this period there were fears that Ha-Shiloah might not reappear and this could prevent any new attempt to publish a Hebrew monthly in the future.

"Who would dare to establish a new monthly if Ha-Shiloah - which was edited by a prominent figure in our literature and published by a prominent figure in the Jewish world and administered by a famous company - did not succeed?" (12)

During this period the monthly was handed over to Ahiasaf which became the new publisher. The members of Ahiasaf were confident that the change of publishers would certainly change the luck of Ha-Shiloah. They believed that many people did not try to increase its circulation in order to improve its financial position; they believed that the number of subscribers was not a problem as long as the periodical was published by a very rich man who would certainly come to its rescue when he

---

(11) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.247.

(12) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I/1897 (in a letter from Klausner to A.H.).

felt this to be necessary. If they wanted to spread the views expressed in Ha-Shiloah they would lend it to other readers rather than encourage them to subscribe. But if they knew that Ahiasaf was the publisher they would do their best to increase the number of its subscribers - not only its readers - because they obviously knew that there was a limit to the resources of Ahiasaf. (13)

In 1898 Wissotzky refused to continue his support for Ha-Shiloah. A new fund was established in the form of shares in the Ahiasaf company which were bought by some of the people who respected Ha-Shiloah and its editor, on condition that the money would be reserved for the support of Ha-Shiloah. Under the pressure of his two sons-in-law Wissotzky consented to join the fund. It consisted of 1,400 roubles from Wissotzky and his two sons-in-law, 600 roubles from Barbash and another 600 roubles from a certain Jew called L. Hillman. This fund was separated from the treasury of Ahiasaf and remained in the hands of Barbash. In addition to this 2600 roubles, Ahad Ha-<sup>o</sup>Am hoped to get the help of some contributors who were not in need of their honoraria.

This arrangement was only a part of a complete programme to help Ha-Shiloah. In addition there were cuts in expenditure, reducing the editor's salary to 1000 roubles a year, reducing the honorarium by 20% and reducing the number of printed copies to 1,600.

---

(13) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38II/30.11.1897.

Furthermore, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am asked *Ahiasaf* to stop deducting its 20% commission since it would become the new publisher. (14)

Despite all these economies, the anticipated cost of the following two volumes was to be 6,000 roubles and this would be covered by 1500 subscribers. (15) Another way to help Ha-Shiloah financially was to publish, jointly with A. Kaminka, a paper in Berlin as a supplement to Ha-Shiloah. It was to be called Afiqim ba-Negev.

The idea did not materialize because Kaminka was discouraged by Ben-Avigdor from entering into partnership with *Ahiasaf*. (16)

When Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am resumed the publication of Ha-Shiloah at the beginning of 1898, one of the harsh measures which he took in his plan for economies was the reduction of payment to his contributors by 20%, as we have seen.

The new rate was 1,50 roubles for a page of prose and .,08 rouble for each stanza of poetry. When Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote to Bialik to inform him about the new rate the latter's answer was that it was very reasonable because no-one else was paying more. (17) The writers who depended on the fees for writing as their only income were exempted from this treatment; they were paid according to the old rate.

From the beginning of 1898 *Ahiasaf* accepted subscriptions on complete volumes only. This decision

---

(14) 'Iggerot A.H. vo. i, p.267.

(15) Ibid., p.263.

(16) In a letter from Ben-Avigdor to A. Kaminka, Genazim, vol. iv, p.35.

(17) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.98.

was unwise. As a result Ha-Shiloah lost all the readers who were subscribing quarterly because they were unable to subscribe for complete volumes.

Despite all these arrangements, the number of subscribers for the third volume was not more than 1200 and the future of the monthly was always in doubt. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and *Ahiasaf* exchanged the blame for this lack of success. He accused them of mismanagement and they accused him of failing to supply the readers with what they wanted to read. Nevertheless Ha-Shiloah struggled through its third year with a maximum of 1300 subscribers.

In 1899 Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was asked by the Odessa Zionist Committee to pay his third visit to Palestine and to report back on the state of colonisation. He suggested to *Ahiasaf* that they should suspend the publication of Ha-Shiloah for some months.

"You could", he wrote, " make use of this interval by devoting more energy to Ha-Shiloah in order to set it up once and for all on the basis that it would be able to continue for at least three years without interruption or worry."(18)

*Ahiasaf* did not accept this idea because Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was to return in the summer. That was not at all a suitable time for renewing subscriptions since most of the readers would be on their summer holidays. Their opinion was either to give the editorship temporarily to Bernfeld or Ehrenpreis on certain conditions, or to

---

(18) 'Iggerot A.H. Vol. ii, p.166.

let someone else pay the visit, or otherwise for  
 Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to go to Palestine and forget about  
Ha-Shiloah. (19)

In the event Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am went to Palestine and the  
 last three issues of volume six were edited by Bernfeld  
 who had been a regular contributor to Ha-Shiloah and a  
 close friend of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. The monthly did not appear  
 during the year 1900 because of the reason mentioned  
 above and because of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's physical exhaustion  
 after returning from Palestine. He was advised to  
 take some rest from work and this he did.

During this year - 1900 - both Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and  
 Ahiasaf were searching for a successful way of publishing  
 the paper which would not involve substantial losses of  
 money. In addition to all the cuts in expenditure,  
 they decided to have Ha-Shiloah printed in Cracow; this  
 would save the higher charges which they were paying to  
 the printer in Berlin.

There was a suggestion that the monthly should  
 be converted into a weekly or bi-weekly. The idea was  
 not accepted. But it gave rise to the following letter  
 from Klausner to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am which shows how greatly  
Ha-Shiloah was respected by the Hebrew reading public.

---

(19) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38II.

"I was informed that they want to convert Ha-Shiloah from a monthly into a weekly.

If they could come to Basle and see how great is the influence of Ha-Shiloah, particularly as a scientific and literary monthly giving a great deal of monthly instalments of important articles which are written with gravity, they would change their mind. I said already in my previous letter how much people talk about you and your monthly at every meeting here, and to what extent they value it. They consider it the only Jewish scientific organ. But if the subscribers of Ha-Shiloah are not enough to support it despite this friendly attitude, then they will not increase even if it is to be converted into a daily or some other form."(20)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am himself was against the idea of converting Ha-Shiloah into a weekly. In a letter to Ahiasaf he declared:

"It will not be easy for us to make our reading public appreciate the quality of a periodical of this sort... In spite of being a weekly, it will be empty from the superficiality and the babble of the weeklies and it will also be similar to monthlies either in its quality or in its external character."(21)

However, he did not rule out the possibility of changing Ha-Shiloah into some other form. He thought that it would be more appropriate to publish it for some time as a bi-weekly in the shape of four quires and to have it printed in Cracow. In this case two issues of four quires would cost as much as one issue of six quires. He suggested that this should be only for a trial period until it would be possible to publish it as a weekly. After much con-

---

(20) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I ,

(21) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. 11, p.336.



sideration the final decision was for Ha-Shiloah to resume publication as before with some changes in the publicistic section in order to bring it closer to the day-to-day life and thereby to attract some subscribers during its fourth year. This started at the beginning of 1901.

At the same time Ahiasaf decided, against Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's wish, to publish a popular weekly hoping that it would attract a large number of subscribers and cover part of the losses of Ha-Shiloah. For economic reasons they decided to print the new weekly, which they called Ha-Dor, in Cracow with Ha-Shiloah. The printer J. Fischer was also its official editor. The actual editor was D. Frischmann (1860-1922) who edited the weekly from Warsaw. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was against the idea of publishing a popular weekly for fear that it might affect the chances of success of Ha-Shiloah. He was also against appointing Frischmann as its editor because he was known as an anti-nationalist.<sup>(22)</sup> He expressed this opinion in his "letter to the editor" published in the first issue of Ha-Dor.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's fears regarding the effect of Ha-Dor on Ha-Shiloah were proved right. The new weekly attracted not only his subscribers but also his contributors. The purpose of publishing this weekly was not fulfilled because Ha-Dor was also far from being a financial success. The number of its subscribers was only 1000 during the first half year and 700 in the second.<sup>(23)</sup>

---

(22) Ibid., p.390.

(23) 'Arkhiyon A.H./926/22.8.1901.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am predicted that the first year of Ha-Dor would be its last. "The subscribers", he declared, "were very few, the contributors were lazy and the editor was cursing his day."<sup>(24)</sup> He realized how serious was the danger of Ha-Dor to Ha-Shiloah because there was no definite delimitation between the two regarding the quality of the literary material which they published, and they appeared to be rivals. Ahiasaf suggested stopping the publication of Ha-Dor in order to restore the confidence of the reading public in Ha-Shiloah.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am opposed the idea for this reason:

821ew  
"The readers of Ha-Shiloah consist of two groups: the intellectual who wants the scientific and literary knowledge of the kind which Ha-Shiloah provides, and the wise fathersfamilias who know that it is impossible to satisfy their needs from Ha-Melis only.

So they chose Ha-Shiloah in spite of their difficulty in understanding it... But when Ha-Dor was established this reading public was divided into three groups. One was the rich who did not think much about which periodical he would choose, but subscribed immediately to both of them. The second type of reader was the poor man who was unable to afford ten roubles a year.

This type was forced to choose either Ha-Shiloah or Ha-Dor. Therefore many

a fathersfamilias chose Ha-Dor which was easy to digest, while the real intellectual who was accustomed to reading books and articles with attention remained faithful to Ha-Shiloah. The result was a decrease

in the number of subscribers to Ha-Shiloah because of Ha-Dor, while Ha-Dor itself is unable to attract a substantial number of subscribers; both are now in a difficult position."<sup>(25)</sup>

---

(24) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.44.

(25) Ibid., p.102.

This explanation was true to some extent, but the real reason for this financial failure of both Ha-Shiloah and Ha-Dor was the strong rivalry between Hebrew and Yiddish periodicals. The proof was to be found in the Yiddish weekly 'Der Jude' which was published by Ahiasaf in Cracow from 1899. This weekly covered the losses of both Ha-Shiloah and Ha-Dor. (26)

By the end of 1901 Ahiasaf was facing the possibility of a financial crisis because of its losses in Ha-Shiloah and Ha-Dor. There were many suggestions for the rescue of both. One was to turn Ha-Shiloah into a high standard scientific quarterly and Ha-Dor into a light magazine for belles lettres and publicistics. Another suggestion was to hand the editorship of Ha-Shiloah over to Rawnitzki and Frischmann in order to give Ahad Ha-CAm enough time to write for Ha-Shiloah. This, it was felt, would possibly attract more readers:

"Rawnitzki was ready to accept this undertaking on the condition that you both would be equal in everything, that is to say, you should not be chief editor and he the 'monitor of propriety', but that he would enjoy all your privileges and you would not then have the right to do anything without consulting him." (27)

The final decision was to discontinue the publication of Ha-Dor - this time too against the wish of Ahad Ha-CAm - and for Ha-Shiloah to remain a monthly under the editorship of Ahad Ha-CAm as before. The only change

---

(26) Hacoheh, Mordekhai ben Hillel: C'Olami, vol. iii, 1926, p.127.

(27) 'Iggerot A.H. le-Frischmann, Reshumot, vol. v, 1927, p.432.

which took place was the return to the first printer in Berlin from the beginning of 1902 and the appointment of Rawnitzki as Associate editor. He edited the section of belles lettres anonymously for some time. (28)

Despite all these changes and all the efforts which aimed at improving the chances of success by making Ha-Shiloah less scientific in order to attract more subscribers, the financial difficulties remained the same. Ahiasaf then decided that if the losses of Ha-Shiloah would exceed 1,000 roubles a year, a meeting would be called to consider whether Ha-Shiloah was worth the sacrifice. Its losses during the last year of Ahad Ha-CAm's editorship (1902) were between 2400 and 2600 roubles. (29)

When Ahad Ha-CAm knew about the decision of Ahiasaf he accepted a post in the Wissotzky tea company; 800 subscribers could not stand the high salary of an editor like himself. (30) He decided to give way to another editor who would be content with little and who might set the paper on the road to success.

---

(28) Ben-'Or: Toledot ha-sifrut ha-Civrit ha-hadashah, vol. iii, p.228..

(29) Yedi'ot Genazim, vol. iv, No: 71, p.639.

(30) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.211.

## 5. FEATURES OF AHAD HA-<sup>C</sup>AM'S EDITORIAL ACTIVITY

Having decided to publish the paper in Berlin Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am studied carefully the administrative side of some high standard periodicals in European languages in order to choose a successful model for his editorial work. He wanted Ha-Shiloah to be different from any other Hebrew periodical not only in its contents but also in the style and arrangement of those contents.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am sent private and official letters to the best Hebrew writers and to all potential contributors. Most of them either did not answer or evaded a direct answer, or promised to write and did not fulfil their promises. They preferred to write for Ha-Melis or Ha-Sefirah where their contribution would be published without prior inspection, rather than to work under the authority of this over-strict editor who read every line and every word.

When Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am accepted this post he believed that the work would proceed easily and smoothly. The financial success of the paper was guaranteed by the publishers and all his friends and admirers would, he felt, come to help him in carrying out his editorial programme. All these dreams proved to be false. Soon after starting the work he already wrote:

"I am like a 'king without a people'.  
I have sent letters to all the best  
writers whose participation is essential  
to my work - till now no-one has replied...  
I had no idea before starting how difficult  
this business was going to be. I did not  
know what Hebrew writers were like, and how

"terribly poor we are in every respect. We have many eminent writers who can write an article for Ha-Melish with plenty of rhetoric and abuse and self praise. But ask any of them to write something that demands knowledge, logic and taste, and he will find some trivial excuse for declining."(1)

It was at this point that Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am realized how difficult his job was. He wrote from Berlin:

"I discovered that there is only one person here who could be considered as a regular assistant, that is Dr. Bernfeld. The other 'doctors' and scholars from whom I had expected help were either ignorant people who could not help or dull specialists who do not want to participate in a project that is intended for the benefit of the whole people."(2)

On another occasion he wrote:

"I am fully aware that I was a fool to accept the position of a father and priest for our miserable literature... If I could repay Mr. Wissotzky the money I have already spent, I would withdraw even now and look for some kind of manual work to support my family."(3)

The main purpose of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am in Ha-Shiloah was

"to train the taste of the Hebrew reading public up to the point at which they would cease to find pleasure in those exhibitions of bad taste and bad manners which were familiar in the Hebrew literature of that time and which the readers swallowed with avidity."(4)

He was determined to create an acceptable level of argument and presentation. In order to conform to requirements in this respect, he involved himself in

- 
- (1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.102.
  - (2) Ibid., p.105.
  - (3) Ibid., p.109.
  - (4) Ibid., p.167.

much work trying to put the contributions of others in an acceptable form. For this reason he devoted most of his time and energy to reading and correcting manuscripts; in consequence, he had little time to contribute to the periodical himself. The publishers were not satisfied, and advised him to engage an assistant in order to give himself more time for writing. He did not accept this suggestion and declared:

"The best of our writers need revision and so I must read everything carefully and make the necessary corrections myself... In the case of inexperienced contributors, it goes without saying that it is my duty as editor to teach them how to write; and I cannot do this unless I read all their manuscripts carefully and revise them in detail. For the same reason, I have to read all the proofs myself because I do not make all the necessary corrections in the manuscripts, and I always find something more to correct at the proof stage. And, of course, all the literary correspondence devolves on me."(5)

It was very hard for an editor to please all classes of Hebrew readers because of the difference in their political religious, social and literary views. It was also very hard to please all the contributors. They would complain if the publication of their contribution were delayed or if the editor dared to change or correct their work. Ahad Ha-Cam described precisely his editorial work in a letter to Kaplan. He wrote:

"I have never come across a job that required harder labour than editing a Hebrew periodical. If the editor wants to fulfil his duties honestly as a person of talent and as a thinker - his job could be as deadly as poison for his spirit."(6)

---

(5) Ibid., p.150.

(6) Ibid., iii, 27.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not accept for publication in Ha-Shiloah any personal attacks or even praise. This was a unique characteristic of Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am.

"He used to delete, without mercy, any rude, sharp, or personal expressions whoever the writer was... And in the ten volumes edited by him he did not agree to publish critical articles which praise either his book 'Al Perashat derakhim' or Ha-Shiloah itself." (7)

The sense of logic and the sense of duty which governed all his thoughts and actions prevented Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am from making Ha-Shiloah the organ of spiritual Zionism, though that was his doctrine. For him the duties of the editor were fundamental and not his privileges. He did not allow himself to give priority to his own views over those of others. A good proof of this attitude is that on each issue the editor's name was written not as Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am - the literary and public name under which he expressed his political and literary views - but as Asher Ginzberg. Despite his opposition to political Zionism after the first Zionist Congress in 1897 he prevented the publication of any personal attacks against Herzl or any subjective criticism against his movement. Nevertheless he made room in Ha-Shiloah for objective criticism of this movement. This criticism of an idea which was accepted and respected by thousands of Jews increased his enemies and antagonized many of

---

(7) Klausner: Le Zikhro shel Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, 1957, p.29.



his admirers; above all it had serious effect on the circulation of Ha-Shiloah.

Even Ahiasaf were critical of Ahad Ha-CAm's attitude towards the national movement. This opposition was reflected in a letter to him. They wrote:

"The issue has generally been received here with satisfaction, but Hovevé Zion are very angry because it does not include anything in the spirit of Hibbat Zion. They all were expecting Ha-Shiloah to be the unofficial organ of Hibbat Zion." (8)

Ahad Ha-CAm had known that this was likely to happen. He stated: "If Ha-Shiloah could not survive without showing favour to one faction or another and denying the truth for the same reason, then it should cease to exist. Nor would I have any desire for its existence." (9)

From the second year of its publication onward Ha-Shiloah became - unintentionally - the organ of spiritual Zionism and Ahad Ha-CAm allowed more articles on this topic, although it was against his own principle<sup>spiritual</sup>. Bernfeld drew his attention to this fact Ahad Ha-CAm replied:

"If you knew how Zionism has spread among all the factions of our people here and to what extent the fanatics offend any one who dares to question the holiness of its leaders, you would not be surprised to see that this topic extends over many pages of Ha-Shiloah" (10)

Regarding the financial side, the editor did not accept any donations. His view was that the publishers

---

(8) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I/23.11.1896.

(9) 'Iggerot, ii, 162.

(10) Ibid., i, 249.

were responsible for covering all its losses and for doing everything possible to help Ha-Shiloah to increase its subscribers. He refused the suggestion that copies should be sent to rich Jews who might help Ha-Shiloah declaring that it would be an insult to Hebrew literature if Ha-Shiloah were sent to anyone who had not asked for it, no matter who he might be.<sup>(11)</sup> Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am considered himself different from other editors and Ha-Shiloah different from other periodicals. He stated;

"There is a great difference between myself and other editors who have successfully struggled through. They were willing to accept subsidies, to beg for help from famous institutions, to make lavish promises to their contributors and readers without worrying whether they would be able to fulfil them. I could not do these things even if it were legitimate to do them for the sake of Hebrew literature."<sup>(12)</sup>

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am used to publish lists of new books on the wrapper. When Ahiasaf opposed this method, claiming that the authors would be offended, he replied:

"If I publish this list inside the issue I will be robbing the readers and they will be truly angry. There are indeed some European periodicals which publish lists inside the issue, but this is only because their issues are larger and they can afford to give away one page - while we cannot. Another reason is that most of the books listed in the European periodicals are of real value while most of our books are empty."<sup>(13)</sup>

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and Ahiasaf differed even on the colour of the wrapper and the type of advertisements which should

---

(11) Ibid., ii, 232.

(12) Ibid., i, 224.

(13) Ibid., 123.

appear on it. They suggested to him several times adding some pages to each issue and printing advertisements at the end which could form an additional quire for each volume and would provide Ha-Shiloah with a regular income. But Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not agree. They even suggested adding a complete quire to the last issue of the first volume provided that he had enough good material. His reply was that Hebrew writers were not capable of providing him with this good material and the readers had no real need for it.<sup>(14)</sup> When Ahiasaf decided to attract more subscribers to Ha-Shiloah by giving them reductions in the prices of Hebrew books published by their firm, he considered this to be a shameful method of attracting subscribers.<sup>(15)</sup>

Ahiasaf regarded the financial side of the business only. They took into consideration only what might increase their profit. On the other hand Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's main concern was the quality of material to be published in his periodical. He had expected from the beginning that there would be some kind of misunderstanding between himself and the publishers. In order to avoid this he wrote to Ahiasaf:

"I hereby inform you at the outset that I will not sell my spiritual independence for all the money in the world. I shall continue to edit Ha-Shiloah as hitherto according to my own spirit and understanding, without trimming its sails to any wind. In the present time it is very likely that the course of Ha-Shiloah will have to be against the dominant current!"<sup>(16)</sup>

---

(14) Ibid., 179.

(15) Ibid., ii, 181.

(16) Ibid., i, 267.

*Ahiasaf* was no less responsible than *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* for the uncertainty about the future of Ha-Shiloah. His published letters include more than a hundred letters to *Ahiasaf* and Kaplan its director. From these letters there emerges a clear picture of how this company brought to an end his editorial activity - although he was its official and spiritual director. Because he was living in Odessa while the headquarters of the company was in Warsaw, his fellow-directors took over responsibility for the company. For them *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* was "like a dummy whose name others can write and sign according to their own wishes and without his knowledge."<sup>(17)</sup> They were not very careful in appointing active agents, and many copies were lost by being sent twice. On the other hand, he was very precise in reporting to them all the details that they might need to know. For example, he used to supply them with the names of contributors and periodicals to whom Ha-Shiloah should be sent free.

In 1898 Frischmann suggested to *Ahiasaf* that he was prepared to take the responsibility for writing a regular section in Ha-Shiloah. When *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* was asked for his opinion, he replied:

"Even if Herbert Spencer were to ask me to place a section of the paper entirely at his disposal, I should refuse. Apparently these people have peculiar ideas about the duties and rights of contributors and editors."<sup>(18)</sup>

A similar answer was given to Ehrepreis when he asked *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* if manuscripts could be supplied directly

---

(17) Ibid., 202.

(18) Ibid., ii, 13.

to the printer to avoid delay in publication. His principle was that

"Since the establishment of Ha-Shiloah not a single line has been published even on the wrapper whose text I have not read beforehand. I have to maintain this policy also in the future; and therefore I would not give this privilege to any writer."(19)

The reaction of the publishers following the publication of the first issue was a mixture of pleasure and dissatisfaction. They wrote to him: "A spirit of grace characterizes both the external appearance of the issue and its quality. This is a European journal in every sense of the word."(20) On the other hand they complained that if Ahad Ha-Cam were himself to contribute to the periodical there would be no lack of subscribers. To this he replied:

"To my knowledge only 10% of the editors of European monthlies write articles themselves... If an editor does write, it is because he is a writer and wants to write, not because he is the editor."(21)

This was a convincing excuse but it was not the real reason for the absence of articles by Ahad Ha-Cam. He was by nature unproductive even before the publication of Ha-Shiloah.

Ahiasaf accepted the argument of Ahad Ha-Cam that he was not under any obligation to contribute to

---

(19) Ibid., p.46.

(20) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I/1896.

(21) 'Iggerot A.H., i, 150.

Ha-Shiloah because he was its editor. They wrote to him:

"You say that this is not a duty of the editor and that editors of periodicals in other languages do not contribute themselves to their periodicals. This is all true, but in other languages there are other good writers beside the editor; and so the editor can fulfil his obligations. If you had had two or three more writers like Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am you would have been able to sit quietly. But you do not have writers of this sort and those who are assisting you do not have either the ability or the talent to say something worthwhile. It is not surprising, therefore, that they all ask you to fill their places."(22)

When a similar criticism was voiced by J. Zeitlin, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's answer was:

"As a writer I do not find any reason for writing now more than I was doing before. In the past, too, I was able to write as I wished; and periodicals always consented to publish my articles willingly. If I did not write much until now, it is not because there was no place for publishing my works, but simply because I am not a chatterbox by nature. What others may write and expand over tens of pages I prefer to abbreviate and say in a few words because I do not have the ability to write much. This reason remains the same... The editor's duty is not to write himself, but to ensure that others write in a reasonable way, and I fulfil this obligation properly."(23)

Another reason for the lack of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's own contributions was the effect of his editorial work; it consumed his time and energy. He wrote to Kaplan:

"You are certainly right in saying that I give my strength to strangers and waste most of my time and energy in correcting what others write. I am distressed about this. I feel

---

(22) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38I/2.1.1897.

(23) 'Iggerot, i, 166.

that this work is ruining me intellectually and in the end it will kill me spiritually and perhaps physically too. But there is no alternative, except to give up the editorship. So long as I edit Ha-Shiloah

I cannot do otherwise. If it were not for the hard work that I put into almost every single contribution, Ha-Shiloah would be like our other Hebrew papers. I would then be guilty of a sin against Hebrew literature by increasing the amount of rubbish that is printed in Hebrew and helping to corrupt the taste of the few Hebrew readers."(24)

The enthusiastic reception given to the first issue by both the reading public and the publishers was less after the publication of the second issue. Kaplan declared in a letter to Ahad Ha-Cam:

"The impression which the first issue has left on me has been weakened after receiving the second issue. I do not consider it inferior to the first issue. But the first one left a very good impression only because it was the first - like any new thing. This impression was reduced to some extent by the second issue which lacks the quality of being new. That is an indication of its lifelessness... You, too, will certainly admit that Ha-Shiloah did not show any sign that it is trying to carry out its mission not only regarding 'science' but also regarding 'current events'. There are few readers who feel the shortage of scientific articles in Ha-Shiloah, while there are many who feel the shortage of publicistics. There are few who would like to see the scientific section as the central point in Ha-Shiloah while the majority had hoped and is still hoping to find in Ha-Shiloah articles on current events because this is the most essential subject for them."(25)

On the other hand, there were others who considered the belletristic section as the weak point in Ha-Shiloah.

---

(24) Ibid., iii, 86.

(25) Arkhiyon A.H./38I/2.1.1897.

and demanded its improvement.<sup>(26)</sup> They even criticized the permanent form which Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am gave to his monthly:

"Ha-Shiloah is now purely academic. They say justifiably that before the publication of an issue, or rather before the publication of the contents, every reader can tell where would be the columns "Mahshavot u-Ma<sup>C</sup>asim" or "Ha-hashqafah" and where the names Bernfeld and Neumark would be found."<sup>(27)</sup>

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am did not pay any attention to this criticism and rejected all the suggestions which aimed at popularizing Ha-Shiloah. He wrote to Ahiasaf in this regard:

"I will never do that, even if I have to see it die. Ha-Shiloah is my darling as long as it is what I want it to be. But if it becomes what others want it to be, then it will cease to be dear to me and I shall not care for it."<sup>(28)</sup>

As editor Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am assumed a power and authority which were previously unknown in Hebrew literature. He appointed himself the supreme judge of good literary taste and of the type of material which he was prepared to publish in Ha-Shiloah. He succeeded to a great extent in imposing his own views on his contributors because of their respect for him as writer and as thinker, despite the fact that most of them were more experienced than him in both the literary and the editorial work. Unlike most of the other periodicals which survived for a long time Ha-Shiloah was not a financial success. Nevertheless, it succeeded from the

---

(26) Ibid., /926/3.2.1897

(27) Ibid., 38II/1898.

(28) 'Iggerot A.H., ii, 160.



beginning in creating a good image in the eyes of its few readers and contributors. It was considered an honour for writers of that time to participate in Ha-Shiloah. This feeling was described by S. Ben-Zion who said:

"Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am himself praises my talent!! - He who is the only writer whose work I used to read with great admiration, with the feeling that he is arranging my thoughts, redeeming my soul, whose help and logic enabled me to think; he who was for me the symbol of literary morality, whose essays I used to study in order to learn how it would be possible for me to write stories with the same honesty, the same beautiful order and the same naturalness."(29)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wanted Ha-Shiloah to be of a didactic and pedagogic nature, and so it was. He considered himself responsible for the style and manner in which material should be presented in Ha-Shiloah. For this reason he allowed himself to correct the language and style of his contributors, or even to excise or add in order to make the views of his contributors clear to the readers. But he never allowed himself to change the meaning by adding anything which the contributor did not intend to write. He declared:

"In my opinion it is the editor's duty to give his readers the opportunity to judge the contents themselves. If he does not agree with the views of his contributors, he may add an editorial remark to explain the reasons for his disagreement."(30)

If, from his point of view, there were changes to be made he would either make them himself and inform the

---

(29) Fishman, J.: 'Amat ha-binyan, p.424.

(30) 'Iggerot A.H., iii, p.49.

contributor, or suggest what should be done and return the manuscript to the author to carry it out. In most cases his suggestions were accepted. By making these corrections Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was doing two things: on the one hand, he protected Hebrew style and the taste of the few Hebrew readers from being spoiled, and on the other hand, he protected the reputation of his contributors by preventing them from saying things in Ha-Shiloah which might lessen the readers' respect for them.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am outlined his editorial work in a letter to Bernfeld. In it he explained that:

"apart from general literary revision - by which I mean the correction of language and style according to the rules of grammar and logic (which many of our writers disregard), I try to get rid of pointless verbiage, of anything spiteful or personal, of exaggerated self-praise or of eulogies of others... Most of the articles which I print in Ha-Shiloah I treat as though they were my own. I cut and alter as much as may be necessary... sometimes I have to excise whole pages... There is no other way of editing a Hebrew paper of decent standard. We have not yet a considerable number of writers whose taste and judgement are sufficiently developed." (31)

In some cases he had to spend on articles as much time as had been spent on writing them. In fact, no article was printed in its original form without some changes.

There were writers who accepted this treatment willingly. One of them was S. Ben Zion who thanked Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am for the changes which he had made in one of his stories. (32) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was delighted and

(31) Ibid., ii, 308.

(32) "CAI qeseh gevul ha-yaldot", Ha-Shiloah iv, pp.430-437, 529-541.

wrote to Ben-Zion: "Your words on the changes which I have made in your story have pleased me very much. Not every day could such 'miracle' happen that writers would thank me for things of this kind."<sup>(33)</sup> When Rawnitzki wrote to him that his impression after seeing the first issue was that it could have been edited by any other writer and not particularly Asher Ginzberg,<sup>(34)</sup> the latter replied: "I am glad that I have succeeded in the editorship to the extent that the eye of an expert critic like you could not see my corrections on every single page."<sup>(35)</sup>

There were others who accepted this treatment reluctantly and grumbled from time to time. One of them was Berdyczewski who protested that the editor was destroying the character of his writers by changing their work. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's answer was:

"I do not accept your accusation that I destroy the character of writers.. On the contrary, I try to preserve the thoughts and style of every writer. All that I require is that these thoughts should be understood easily, that they should be written without unnecessary phraseology and that the style should be in the manner of real scholars who write modestly and without over-emphasizing their character."<sup>(36)</sup>

When Berdyczewski protested that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's remarks against him might destroy his literary reputation, the editor replied:

- 
- (33) 'Iggerot A.H., ii, 211.  
 (34) 'Arkhiyon A.H./926/1896.  
 (35) 'Iggerot, i, 160.  
 (36) Ibid., 249.

"When the publishers saw your name printed clearly on one of the articles in Ha-Shiloah they all opened their eyes and came to the conclusion that you are a writer of genius, and the doors were opened... They allowed you to write what you wanted in your own style and language, and did not bother to correct your linguistic and grammatical mistakes."(37)

In the same vein he wrote to Klausner:

"What I used to do until now was that if I received an article from an unknown writer I took much trouble to improve its form so that it could be worth printing - provided that there was in it an idea which was worth publishing, even if the language and style were of low standard. I thought that by doing this I would benefit our literature. But I realize that I was mistaken. In this way I gave a literary 'passport' to various writers despite their lack of knowledge and taste. Now various publishers print the works of those writers without correcting them, on the grounds that their names appeared in Ha-Shiloah. Those publishers do not know how much trouble I had to take in order to set their contributions in a satisfactory form."(38)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not show favour to any of his contributors; no-one was exempted from his severe treatment. Even Klausner and Bialik, who succeeded him in editing Ha-Shiloah and were both influenced by his style and philosophy also received the same treatment. Some of their works were rejected and many were corrected by the editor. When Klausner complained about this Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am replied:

"As for the alterations which I made in your articles I will give you a piece of advice: choose one which appeared in Ha-Shiloah and another which was published elsewhere and give them both to an intelligent reader with a European taste - he will tell you which one of them is nearer to the European form of literature"(39)

---

(37) Ibid., ii, 27.

(38) Ibid., 372.

(39) Ibid., i, 279.

In all Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's letters to his contributors he wrote of changes to be made either in language and style or in contents. Some writers sent him their work on the understanding that the editor would be free to correct and change whenever he considered this necessary. Others used to argue with him about any change he might want to make. Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wrote to one of them:

"I cannot enter into a detailed correspondence with each writer on every single change. It is alright if you can allow me to do in your story what I want. If not, then I cannot accept it."(40)

And to another he wrote:

"If I wanted to write letters on articles which are not acceptable my days and nights would not be enough. What is not acceptable is not worth publishing, and no explanation is required. This time too I cannot publish your work, and I advise you to stop writing articles because your articles lack any sign of talent."(41)

This kind of treatment was the reason behind the refusal of many writers to continue to work for Ha-Shiloah and it turned some of them against Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. He wrote in a letter to Bernfeld from Warsaw:

"Our honourable writers here are eager to swallow me alive. They now hate me with all their hearts and souls either because I rejected their work or because I presumed to change their talented work."(42)

On another occasion he wrote:

"My position in literature has deteriorated in this sensitive generation. If I do not accept Herzlian policy - I am anti-Zionist; if I do not consider the imitation of alien literatures by our writers as a natural

---

(40) Ibid., ii, 8.

(41) Ibid., i, 225.

(42) Ibid., 186.

development - I am against belles lettres; if I do not admit that Berdyczewski is a 'genius' - I hate life; and if I find it unnecessary to write scientific remarks in the wrong place - I hate science."(43)

There were writers who resented this treatment and considered it humiliating to be corrected by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. When Y.L. Kantor criticized Klausner's method in coining new words Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not publish Klausner's name in the article. This action did not please Kantor who wrote to Frischmann describing Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as being like a school girl who would easily blush on reading strong words. He declared that a man of this quality is not fit to edit a Hebrew periodical. (44) This opinion was shared by Ben-Avigdor who suspected that Ha-Shiloah would not live long because its editor was far from being editor of a satisfactory periodical. (45) Frischmann wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am suggesting that he should modify his policy in order not to drive Kantor and others away from Ha-Shiloah. (46) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not agree. He wrote later:

"I will never kneel or bow before any lad or even before the best writer. If any writer finds himself some day unwilling to collaborate with me because I do not entreat him as much as he wants; only then will I take off the crown and you (Ahiasaf) will be able to give it to someone who is better than me."(47)

And when Ahiasaf advised him to try to attract more contributors to Ha-Shiloah he replied:

---

(43) Ibid., iii, 62.

(44) He-<sup>c</sup>Avar, vol. iv, p.149.

(45) Genagim, vol. iv, 1971, p.35.

(46) "'Iggerot Frischmann 'el Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am", Ha-Tequfah, xxx, p.353.

(47) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.406.

"The time has come when we see seven publishers take hold of a single writer and every one is trying to drag him to his shop... But I shall not do that. If it is not possible to attract writers without 'dragging' then, I would rather close my shop or hand it over to somebody else."(48)

In his opinion Ha-Shiloah lacked only the contribution of Y.L. Katzenelson, Dubnow and Zalman Epstein.(49)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am laid down the rules that he would not accept any translation or any material which had been published elsewhere. He also did not allow his contributors to translate or even to comment on articles in Ha-Shiloah which had not yet appeared in print. He made it a condition that his contributors were not allowed to republish their work which appeared in Ha-Shiloah before two years from the time of its publication.(50) He did not accept conditions on the part of his contributors concerning either payment or the date of publishing their work, or about being consulted before he made corrections in their work. It was always he who prescribed the conditions.

It was due to the will power and strong influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am that he succeeded in establishing the most important Hebrew periodical of the time and in maintaining its literary standard at the level of any European periodical - despite the trouble he had to take in order to make contributions meet his own requirements.

---

(48) Ibid., p.179.

(49) Ibid., vol. i, p.283.

(50) Arkhiyon K./197/5.11.1908.

Most of the great names in modern Hebrew literature were either born and brought up as writers in Ha-Shiloah, or reached the climax of their literary maturity in it. It is widely held that all the talented Hebrew writers had contributed to Ha-Shiloah, but there is some exaggeration in this statement. There were some popular writers who were not even invited to work in Ha-Shiloah like N. Sokolow, I.L. Peretz, Ben-Avigdor, Ben-Yehudah, Z. Jawitz, and Shalom Alekhem. Others did not appear more than a few times, like Tchernichowsky and Frischmann. Those writers and many others were already at the golden age of their literary career and were well known to the Hebrew reading public, but there is no obvious reason for the absence of their names in Ha-Shiloah.

When Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am decided to resign he explained to his readers the reasons behind his decision. He wrote:

"I am not ashamed to say openly that during these years my work has proceeded backwards and not forwards. The moral and material powers upon which my work depended have decreased from one year to the next. Most of the old writers have become too weak to write, while the new writers who would fill their place are few in number. The reading public also has not shown enough evidence of a real need for a literary periodical of this kind."(51)

No wonder that Ha-Shiloah was not very popular among the average Hebrew readers. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am disqualified things which were considered by the young generation as

---

(51) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, "Mikhtav 'el ha-<sup>c</sup>orekh", Ha-Shiloah, xi, 11.



necessary like belles lettres for its own sake and general culture in Hebrew. Klausner explained the reasons for this failure when he wrote:

"First, the nature of the Jew who quickly rejects anything old even if it is excellent, and has always a great desire for anything new even if it is worse than the old; secondly, Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's campaign against political Zionism, orthodox Jews and the younger writers; his negative attitude towards belles lettres and art for its own sake, as well as his insistence on publishing only what is attributed to Jewishness." (52)

Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am edited Ha-Shiloah for a monthly salary of 125 roubles. This was increased to 150 roubles from April 1898, (53) and to two thousand roubles a year in the following year. (54) Aḥiasaf suggested that he should move to Warsaw and become director of the company while continuing his editorial work, for a salary of 2,600 roubles a year. But he did not accept because of the gap between their views and his own views regarding ways of developing the literature. He resigned the editorship at the end of 1902.

---

(52) Klausner, : Darki leqrat Ha-tehiyyah we-ha-ge'aolah, p.99.

(53) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38II/1898.

(54) Ben Hillel Hacohen, M.: "<sup>c</sup>Alim me-yoman yashan", Sefer Klausner, p.453.

## 6. A LITERARY SURVEY OF HA-SHILOAH DURING THE FIRST PERIOD

The best way to conduct this survey is to follow the categories which were outlined by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am in his manifesto. It is hard, however, to give precise estimation of the number of pages allocated to each category in each issue for two reasons. First, there was an overlap between the sections, and secondly, the editor was controlled by the quantity and the quality of material received for each section. In consequence the balance between the sections was not maintained. Even the arrangement of material was not according to a fixed plan during the first two years until Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am devised a permanent layout for the periodical as he indicated in a letter to Bernfeld:

"... In the beginning I give two scientific or literary articles followed by some belles lettres, then come two more articles followed by a story or a literary sketch or a light article on the history of literature, etc... Then comes a poem (not more than one) followed by a critical article or review of new books or both, afterwards - various publicistic articles... Then a feuilleton... And finally - short articles and comments."(1)

1. Articles on science: in his editorial statement Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am stressed the importance of this section. Through it he intended to educate a new type of Hebrew reader on whom Ha-Shiloah could depend for literary and financial support. Nevertheless it was

---

(1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.314.

not in any way superior to the other sections. Its share was nearly one quarter of each issue (20-25 pages) and included articles dealing with various aspects of Jewish studies. These articles were not deep enough to satisfy the specialist and not light enough to satisfy the average reader. The range of these aspects was very wide to cover subjects like Bible and Jewish history (Bernfeld), Talmud and Halakhah (H.Tchernowitz), Philosophy (D. Neumark), Apocryphal Books and Mediaeval literature (D. Kahana).

Bernfeld was not only the champion of this section but also of other sections in Ha-Shiloah. He comes second after Klausner in the number of times in which his name appeared in Ha-Shiloah as contributor. The subject-matter of his articles covered all branches of Hebrew literature except belles lettres but the majority of his articles were devoted to historical and cultural aspects from the time of the Bible till the modern period.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was criticized because he gave a wide space to articles written by Bernfeld. His reply was:

"...A writer like Bernfeld who sits down and writes for me every time I ask him, and who keeps his promises with accuracy, such a writer I consider as a 'charming treasure' without whom I cannot survive."(2)

On another occasion he said in a letter to Frischmann:

"...Do you know that without Bernfeld, I would have been waiting till today for the pity of our writers, unable to publish even a single issue? He does not make a fuss about trifles and in almost every one of his articles I do as I like."(3)

---

(2) Ibid., i, p.180..

(3) Reshumot, vol. v, 1927, p.432.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am considered Bernfeld and himself as comrades fighting one battle and facing the same fate. He wrote to him once:

"...There are moments when you and I and the rest of our circle seem to me to be like the last of the classical writers in the days when Graeco-Roman culture was fighting its last battle against Christianity. Whenever I happen to read about those writers I cannot rid my mind of the idea that we are fighting a lost battle, as they did. But I try with all my strength to keep my faith alive and not to be discouraged."(4)

When Bernfeld wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am hinting that it was Ha-Shiloah and its editor who brought him back to Hebrew literature, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am replied:

"Both we and the reading public know that among all the writers who became popular during the last few years and deserve attention your share is more than that of all your colleagues... From now on if anyone will come and claim that I do not write for our Hebrew literature except a very little every now and then - I will have an eloquent answer... Bernfeld alone has given to it more than could be expected from ten writers."(5)

When Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am resigned the editorship of Ha-Shiloah he wrote to Bernfeld to thank him for being a great help to Ha-Shiloah and its editor: "There were very few of my contributors on whom I was able to rely; only you were my support from the very beginning till the very end, and I shall never forget this favour."(6)

Bernfeld wrote his articles in an easy Biblical language, that was influenced to a great extent by Ahad

---

(4) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.149.

(5) Ibid., vol. ii, p.240.

(6) Ibid., vol. ii, p.216.

Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's style. Bernfeld was against the use of *Melitsah* and most of his works, even the scientific articles were written in a typical journalistic style. His attitude toward the development of Hebrew was similar to that of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. He preferred to use foreign words rather than the newly coined Hebrew ones.

A large number of his articles in this section were mainly historical. The first was "*Ernest Renan we-yihuso 'el-ha-yahadut*" (Ernest Renan and his attitude towards Judaism) in volume I. In the first part (pp.24-37) Bernfeld gave an introduction on the historiography of the Jewish people and how scholars from other nations approached it. Then he gave a brief biography of Renan and his writings on religious and linguistic matters. In the second (pp.101-116) and third (pp.197-210) parts he gave a critical review of Renan's book on the history of the Jews and discussed his views on the purity of the Jewish race.

Another article was "*Dorshe' Reshumot*" (Historians) in four instalments in volume 2. It is an account of works on the history of the Jews from the time of the Bible till the nineteenth century and a critical review of each work.

The article "*Merive' Cohen*" (Opponents of Priest) in volume 3, is a discussion of the development of priesthood in Judaism from its early days until the destruction of the Temple, and the encounter between prophet and priest, between theory and practice in

Jewish history. He also stressed the importance of the prophecy and the national motives in it.

In volume 4 Bernfeld wrote a series of three articles in which he discussed the cultural and political life of the Jews after the exile. The first was "Yisra'el ba 'Ammim" (Jews among the nations) pp.1-11, 193-201. He started with Babylon where the Jews became acquainted with new thoughts and new religious aspects which were introduced to Babylon by the Persian Empire. Those who escaped this influence by returning to Palestine were faced with another foreign influence, that of Greek culture and afterwards the newly born Christian religion. This development drove some of them to Alexandria where they established a new centre for Jewish studies. Bernfeld discussed in detail the characteristics of each of the three centres and their achievements in the field of Jewish studies.

The second article was "Eres Yisra'el u-vavel" (Palestine and Babylon) pp.289-302. In it the writer wanted to expand his discussion on two of the three centres already discussed in the previous article and the contribution of each of them to the development of Jewish studies.

In the third article "'Or we-Ṣel" (light and shadow) pp.481-493, Bernfeld wanted to elaborate on the mutual cultural influence of Judaism and Islam following the deterioration of the Greek culture and how the Jewish culture was developed under Islam in

Arab-Spain until the spiritual bankruptcy of this centre in the thirteenth century.

Another ring in this chain of historical studies was the article "*be-mašor uve-mašog*" (in siege and in distress) vol. 7, pp.17-29. In this article he discussed the cultural and political life of the Jews in Europe from the thirteenth century to the nineteenth century. He also discussed the events which led to the establishment of the ghetto and the persecution of the Jews and the blood libel which led to several pogroms and social hatred against the Jews.

Subsequently Bernfeld wrote a long article in four parts in volume 8, entitled "*Sanigoriyah*" (Defence) in which he gave an account of the activities of the Jews before and after the destruction of the Second Temple in order to neutralize the effects of the external and internal criticism of Judaism in the three centres mentioned above.

In addition to his historical work in Ha-Shiloah Bernfeld contributed to this section several articles on the Bible such as "*Kitvé Bet-Yiśra'el*" (Jewish writings) in volume 10, pp.97-109, on the history and rules of collecting and arranging the books of the Bible and the interpretations which were added to the text afterwards. Another article was "*Sifré ha-Zikhronot*" (Chronicles) in four parts in volume 10 on the proper order of historical books in the Old Testament. He also discussed some of these books.

*Talmud* and *Shulhan 'Arukh* are two of the topics which were widely discussed in Ha-Shiloah during the editorship of *Ahad Ha-Cam*. The first article in this regard was "*Basis ha-yahadut*" (the foundation of Judaism) by Meir Ish Shalom in volume 2. In this article Ish Shalom suggested that the priority in religious studies should be transferred from the Bible to the Talmud which should be regarded as the foundation of Judaism.

Talmud was also the subject of two more articles in the same volume. The first was "*Nehapye'sah we-nahgorah*" (we should search and investigate) by A. Loli, pp.314-317. In this article he called for a review of some interpretations which were added by the Tannaim and the Amoraim and are not in the spirit of the law of Moses and are being used against Judaism.

The second article was "*Si'ah Talmudit*" (Talmudic Talk) by Ben Zion Katz, pp.440-445. Katz concluded that the wide publicity of *Talmud* encouraged many non-Jewish scholars to study it.

Two different opinions were expressed in the first two articles. While Ish Shalom was zealous in stressing the need for extensive *Talmudic* studies. Loli called for the reform of the Talmud which had become out of touch with the modern life of the Jewish people.

The major contribution to Talmudic discussion in Ha-Shiloah was written by H. Tchernowitz and entitled "*Ha-Talmud - Seqirah kelalit*" (Talmud - a general review), and signed by the pseudonym "Talmudi".



It extended through volumes 7-8 and 10. The series was republished as a book in Warsaw in 1913.

Tchernowitz was also the author of the treatise, "*Le-toledot ha-Shulhan <sup>C</sup>Arukh we-hitpashtuto*", (History of the *Shulhan <sup>C</sup>Arukh* and its propagation) in volumes 4-6 and 9 under the pseudonym "*Rav Sa<sup>C</sup>ir*" which was the pen-name of Tchernowitz. After a long survey of Talmudic studies he explained how Joseph Caro arranged the code of Jewish law in his famous book *Shulhan <sup>C</sup>Arukh* in the sixteenth century. He then gave detailed analysis of how it was received by various communities.

Another aspect to which *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* gave wider space in *Ha-Shiloah* was Jewish philosophy. The first article in this respect was "*Ha-'emunot we-ha-de<sup>C</sup>ot lefi ha-qabbalah*" (Faith and philosophy according to the Kabbalah) by Loli in vol. 1. In it he gave some concepts of the Jewish philosophy as reflected in the Kabbalah.

Neumark's contribution to this section was great. His first important work in it was the series "*She'elat ha-behirah be-Yisra'el u-va-<sup>C</sup>ammim*" (the question of choice among Jews and other nations) in volumes 3-4. In the first part he gave a general introduction on the freedom of mankind in choosing between good and evil and to what extent this freedom is connected to religion. After reviewing the question of choice in the works of some Greek philosophers, the author discussed another aspect which is not related to the subject under discussion. This aspect was the cultural struggle

between Christianity and Judaism, between Greek culture and Jewish culture. In the last part he discussed the question of choice in the works of the Jewish philosopher Yedidiah ha-Alexandarony as a representative of the new generation of Plato's followers.

In a similar discussion of comparison between Jewish and general philosophy H. Zeitlin wrote the treatise "*Ha-tov ve-ha-ra<sup>C</sup>*" (good and evil) in volumes 5-8. It is a series of essays on the development of the doctrines of good and evil in both Jewish and general philosophy. It was republished in 1911 as the first volume of Zeitlin's collected works.

The Spanish period of the Jewish history was given greater attention in Ha-Shiloah of *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am*. In volume 1 D. Kahana wrote the article "*Ḥayyē Shlomo Ibn Gabirol*" (the life of Solomon Ibn Gabirol) which aimed, said Kahana, at completing works of others on the subject. In the first part (pp38-48) he discussed the literary background in Arab-Spain and the influence of Arabic poetry on Hebrew writers. He then gave a biography of Ibn Gabirol from his poems. In the second part (224-235) Kahana reviewed the literary activity of Ibn Gabirol in both Arabic and Hebrew, and his work in the field of philosophy. Kahana expressed his views in a clear language and did not confuse his readers with unnecessary details. He also gave examples from Ibn Gabirol's poetry whenever he thought necessary.

Another article in this field was "*Ḥayyē ha-yehudim*"

*bi-yeme ha-benayim*" (life of the Jews in the Middle Ages) in volume 4, by D. Yellin. In it the author gave an abstract of the book "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages" by I. Abrahams. Yellin wrote another article "*Melisat Yishma<sup>c</sup>ael be-sifrut yisra'el*" (Arabic lyrical style in Jewish literature) in volume 5, where he discussed the influence of Arabic literature on Jewish writers. He only discussed two aspects of this influence with examples from Mediaeval Hebrew poetry.

The fourth article in this area was "*Ha-filosufiyah ha<sup>c</sup>aravit we-hashpa<sup>c</sup>atah<sup>c</sup> al ha-yahadut*" (The Arabic philosophy and its influence on Judaism) in volume 6 by Z. Matter. He gave a general account of Islamic philosophy and its various branches since the beginning of Islam, and to what extent it was influenced by Greek philosophy. The second part of this article which discussed the influence of Islamic philosophy on Jewish writers appeared in vol. 15.

Education was another topic to which Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am paid much attention. One of his aims when he established Ha-Shiloah was to include in it a regular section for discussing some features of pedagogy. His choice fell on J.L. Davidowitch (Ben-David) as responsible for the section. Davidowitch started two series of articles in volume 1. The first was "*She'elat he-hinnukh be-Yisra'el u-va-<sup>c</sup>ammim*" (the question of education among the Jews and the nations) in three instalments. The second article was "*Me-<sup>c</sup>olam ha-hinnukh we-ha-limmud*" (From the

world of education and teaching) also in three instalments in volumes 1-2.

In the first article the author opened by discussing the important role of education in the life of mankind generally and in the life of the Jews in particular. He also discussed the various educational methods known and accepted among the nations. He also outlined the advantages and the disadvantages of each method. In the first part he came to the conclusion that "Nationalist Education" was the most suitable method for the Jews because it would strengthen the religious as well as the national feelings among them provided that this method would absorb all the good elements of other methods. This was a very important issue for discussion in Ha-Shiloah because it touched the interest of every family that cared about the education of its children.

In the second article Davidowtch analysed the subject of education and teaching in Europe. He based his treatment on the debates of 1,700 school-teachers from various types of schools and representing various religions in a conference which took place in Geneva in 1896. He also reviewed educational systems in European countries and how they could help in developing a useful Jewish educational system. Both articles were written in an easy language and the ideas were well arranged; but many technical and non-Hebrew terms had to be introduced in his style because of the lack of equivalents in Hebrew.

This section was short lived. It came to an end with the death of Ben David in 1898, and although the editor was very anxious to find someone to take it over, his attempts were unsuccessful. He was not, however, prevented from publishing occasional articles which dealt with education, like "*Batte' Midreshot la-Rabbanim*" (Houses of learning for Rabbis) by M. Ish Shalom in volume 3, and "*Civrit be-Civrit*" (Teaching Hebrew in Hebrew) by I. Epstein in volume 10, and "*Ha-hinnukh we-ha-heder*", (Education and the *Heder*) by P. Shiffman in the same volume.

Another topic which was important in Ahad Ha-Cam's opinion was philology. The revival and modernization of Hebrew became essential because of its lack of scientific terminology, and of words for new concepts in both the literary and scientific language, as well as the lack of names for new things and objects in the spoken language. In order to overcome this problem some writers called for the expansion of the language either by borrowing from other languages or by coining new words from roots which exist in the Biblical and ~~past~~ Biblical languages. Others favoured the use of ~~past~~ Biblical Hebrew as a source and base for creating a modern style. Hebrew periodicals played a very successful role in the revival of the language as well as in promoting the use of newly coined words.

Like other periodicals Ha-Shiloah was, for some time, the scene of a strong debate between those who were

in favour of widening the scope of the language and those who were against, between the fanatics who wanted the development of the language to be based only on Jewish sources and those who were ready to borrow from all other languages, either European or Semitic. The first article in this argument was "*Siḥat ḥolin*" (Small talk) by M. Balshan (Y.L. Kantor) in volume 1. He criticized methods of coining new words and enriching the language. His criticism was directed mainly against Klausner and his treatise "*Seḥat 'Ever Saḥaḥ Hayyah*." In a long article entitled "*Marḥivē ha-lashon u-mitnaggedehem*" (innovators and their opponents) in volume 1 Klausner came to defend himself and to argue for the need to develop the language in order to enable it to meet the necessities of the new life; coining new words, he pointed out, does not mean inventing a new language.

Another important article was "*Le-harḥavat ha-saḥaḥ*" (towards widening the scope of the language) in volume 3 by M.L. Lilienblum. He stated that the extent of development in the life of any nation corresponds to the development of its concepts and therefore its language too. He also discussed the external and internal elements which could affect the development of any language, like borrowing words from cognate or foreign languages. He gave examples to show that borrowed words existed even in the Bible. His conclusion was that the necessity for widening the scope of the language was at that time more urgent than ever. He pointed out, first, that the literature of that time had started to deal with subjects

which touch aspects of general-human culture. Secondly, it was, he held, the responsibility of Hebrew writers to fill the lack of essential words in the spoken language. This was a great problem for the settlers in Palestine. But not everyone, in his opinion, is capable of coining new words: this is work that should be done by experts who have a perfect knowledge of Hebrew in its various historical stages. He criticized those who have overused Arabic as a source for enriching Hebrew. This is possibly a reference to Ben Yehudeh although he did not mention any names - or perhaps he did but the editor omitted them in order to avoid hurting the feelings of others.

There was another important article entitled "*Harhavat Sefatenu ha-Civrit*" (the expansion of our Hebrew language) in volume 4 by A. Sapir. The author argued in favour of using Arabic for the expansion of Hebrew. He referred to the important role which Arabic played in this field in the mediaeval literature.

I.H. Tawlow made his first appearance in the tenth volume although he was one of the outstanding writers of that time and was one of the first to be approached by the editor. He wrote the article "*Sefat Cever ha-hadashah*" (the modern Hebrew language) in three instalments which dealt with the language of the Mishnah and Tosefta at the time of the Second Temple. It also discussed the influence of Aramaic and Greek on the Jewish writers of that time and the efforts to develop the Biblical

language in order to suit the requirements of their time.

There were also some single articles of great importance in this section:

"*Ginze Teman*", (Treasure of Yemen) by D. Yellin in volume 2. The author gave an outlook of Hebrew poetry produced by Jewish poets from the community of Yemen in the Middle Ages. He also analysed this poetry in comparison with poetry from the Spanish period and the influence of Arabic poetry in both cases.

"*Sefer Ben Sira bi-meqoro ha-Civri*", (The Book of Ben Sira in the original Hebrew text), by D. Kahana in four instalments in volume 3. This article is based on the Hebrew text which was discovered in the Cairo Genizah and was published with an English translation in 1897 by Cowley. This article is a comparative study between the Hebrew text and the Aramaic and Greek translations. The author gave the Hebrew text with footnotes and comments.

"*Divre Ahikar he-hakham*", (Words of Ahikar the wise) by Y. Mazal in volume 4. This was a Hebrew translation based on an English translation, from a Syriac manuscript, by E.J. Dillon which was published in the English monthly Contemporary Review in 1898.

"*Meliset sefat Cever u-ve'ur ha-migra*" (the rhetorical style of Hebrew and interpretation of the Bible) by Isaac Warshawski in three instalments in volumes 3-4. This was an analysis of Biblical rhetorical language showing how various commentators stumbled in explaining Biblical phraseology.



"*Kele' ha-zemer be-Yisra'el*" (Jewish musical instruments) by P. Menkowiski in four instalments in volume 6. After a long introduction about the importance of music in the life of mankind the author discussed the origin and development of Jewish musical instruments from the Biblical time onwards.

"*Sefer Barukh be-leshon Kushit*," (the book of Barukh in Ethiopic), by J. Klausner in volume 9. After an introduction about this Apocryphal book, the various manuscripts which had survived and its alleged writer, Klausner gave a Hebrew translation of the text from an Ethiopic manuscript which had been edited and published in 1866 by A. Dalman in his book "Chrestomathia Aethiopica".

"*Aseret ha-shevetim*", (the Ten Tribes) by S.M. Lazar in eight instalments in volumes 9-10. This treatise analysed the various legends dealing with the fate of the lost Ten Tribes following their exile to Assyria by Tiglathpileser in 722 B.C.

## 2. Publicistics:

The publication of Ha-Shiloah coincided with the convening of the first Zionist Congress in 1897. This event attracted the interest and attention of Jews everywhere and they expected the periodical press to satisfy their needs in this respect. Ha-Shiloah was no exception for it devoted so wide a space to articles dealing with national questions to the extent that this section was

given the primacy in many issues. Nevertheless Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was not satisfied by the standard of the section.

He wrote:

"We have not got any considerable publicist at all. If I am not mistaken, there is a rooted misapprehension among us that publicistics should be considered neither as experience nor as occupation, but only as unfounded opinions. Therefore everyone considers himself capable of writing articles without previous knowledge, while those who can write consider it beneath them to write publicistics."(7)

He proposed to give a monthly review of current events in the Jewish communities on general as well as literary matters.

The review of general matters was given to Bernfeld who started in the first issue a regular column on European Jewries entitled "gehillot Ya<sup>c</sup>agov" while Berdyczewski was given the column on literary reviews which was entitled "le-ro'ah ha-yom." Despite all these efforts, however, this section satisfied neither the editor nor the critics of Ha-Shiloah. In a letter to Ehrenpreis Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote:

"Of the deficiencies you have mentioned in Ha-Shiloah I admit only one: the lack of a monthly review. During the preparations for the establishment of Ha-Shiloah

I approached several writers to take responsibility for this section but I did not succeed... I myself could not and would not be able to do it for several reasons. But if you want to undertake this and to commit yourself to writing it every month with no interruption I shall be much obliged and I shall give it to you with great gratitude."(8)

(7) Ibid., p.67.

(8) Ibid., vol. i, p.271.

Ehrenpreis accepted the responsibility and wrote in volumes 3-4 the column "*Hashqafah Kelalit*", which was signed with the pseudonym "Araz". When, however, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am realized that the views expressed in it were contradictory to the editorial policy he suggested to Ehrenpreis that he should sign his proper name in order to be fully responsible for his views.<sup>(9)</sup> Gradually Ehrenpreis concentrated his discussion on one aspect only, Zionism. For this reason the column was given to S.P. Rabinowitz from volumes 5 to 8 who adopted the pseudonym "<sup>c</sup>Ivri".

This column was given to S. Levin in volumes 9-10 because Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had to spend much time correcting the style and the language of Rabinowitz. Moreover, Rabinowitz was unpunctual and sometimes the publication had to be delayed for this reason. But the main reason was Rabinowitz's acceptance to write the weekly review of Ha-Dor from 1901, and it became impossible for him to write the review in both periodicals without repeating himself.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am advised Levin to avoid the mistakes of his predecessors because Ehrenpreis had devoted all the section to Zionism while Rabinowitz devoted it to German Jewry.<sup>(10)</sup> Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had offered this section previously to Brainin but the latter had asked for a monthly salary which was too high for the financial position of Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(11)</sup> Tawlow, an expert writer to whom Ahad

---

(9) Ibid., vol. ii, p.46.

(10) Ibid., vol. iii, p.129.

(11) Ibid., vol. ii, p.179.

Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am offered the section, asked for all the contemporary periodicals to be made available to him and this would have cost Ha-Shiloah too much.<sup>(12)</sup> It should be mentioned here that Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am struggled very hard to maintain the monthly review in an acceptable form during all the period of his editorship; of this his published letters are good evidence.

In addition to the monthly review there were other regular columns in the publicistic section such as "Yalqut qatan" in which Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am published most of his short essays dealing with national and current events. Another column was "Mahshavot u-ma<sup>C</sup>asim" by Rabbi Qarov (E.L. Lewinsky). Both these columns continued for a long time; the former was written in a critical style, while the latter was written in a feuilletonistic and humorous but not satirical style:

"The feuilletons of Lewinsky are formed of light stuff. They are humorous rather than satirical; they are a criticism of life without the sting and bitterness of censure. They generally do not grapple with one subject only, but deal with life as it is reflected in passing events and transitory occurrences, connecting all those into one whole, not so much by means of central idea as by a suggestive phrase or expression. Their humour is peculiarly Jewish, the racy Talmudic diction, the good-natured, familiar conversational style and the well feigned naivety of the provincial Jew - all these are employed by Lewinsky with great effect."<sup>(13)</sup>

He was the inventor of the popular publicistic feuilleton.<sup>(14)</sup>

---

(12) Ibid., vol. i, p.100.

(13) Waldstern, A.S.: The Evolution of Modern Hebrew Literature, p.120

(14) Kleinman, m.: Demuyot we-qomot, 1928, p.249.

He had a remarkable sense of truth, genuineness and proportion and was blessed with a gift of humour presenting events to his readers in a manner which caused them to smile and see the actions in their true light. His field of observation was wide and extensive and could include numerous events, great and small.

Lewinsky continued to write his "*Mahshavot u-ma<sup>c</sup>asim*" until his death. When he died Ha-Shiloah was already being edited by Klausner. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote to Klausner:

"Ha-Shiloah did not have a wise and more diligent writer than Lewinsky who contributed to it from the first issue until now. He gave to it the best of his thoughts and perceptions... Ha-Shiloah must therefore devote a complete issue to him, which should include only articles and memories of our friend by all those who were close to him during his life and worked with him in the literary or any other field."(15)

This suggestion was accepted and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was one of the contributors to the issue. (16)

It was in these sections that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am angered Hovevé Zion twice in the early volumes of Ha-Shiloah.

The first time was because of remarks in his "*Yalqut Qatan*" (vol. i, p.479) in which he criticized their way of handling the affairs of Jewish settlers in Palestine as well as the publicity which was given to charitable contributions in Hebrew periodicals. The

---

(15) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iv, p.302.

(16) Ha-Shiloah, xiii, No. 6.

second time was because he had accepted for publication in Ha-Shiloah a sarcastic criticism of the first Zionist Congress by Lewinsky in his column (vol. ii, p.374).

These two incidents damaged the financial position of Ha-Shiloah; they led to a decrease in the number of its subscribers because: "after all, it is only they - the lovers of Zion who are also the lovers of our literature."<sup>(17)</sup>

In order to give readers of Ha-Shiloah a clear idea of what was taking place in the Jewish communities in other countries, the editor accepted articles about these communities in the form of reportages. The most regular reports were "*Me-eres Yisra'el*" by Y. Gur, "*Mikhtavim me-Rusiyah*" by Y.L. Kantor and Alter Druyanow, "*Mikhtavim me-Sarefat*," by A. Ludvipol, "*Ha-Yehudim we-ha-yahadut be-Rusiyah*" by S. Lewin, "*Ha yehudim we-hayahadut be-liṭah*" by Ben Zion Katz, "*Ha-yehudim we-ha-yahadut be-Ameriqah*", by M. Raisin and Z. Gershuni, and "*Sefat Ever we-sifrutah be Ameriqah*" by Raisin.

Apart from these regular contributions there were some occasional articles to discuss day-to-day life especially in the political and national fields and reviews about each of the Zionist Congresses.

The editor was also anxious to give a reflection of the literary events taking place either in Hebrew or in a European language provided that they dealt with Jewish matters. When *Ahad Ha-Am* realized that Berdyczewski's work in his column "*Le-ruah ha-yom*" was not exactly what

---

(17) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.220.

he had in mind for that section, he gave it to Mordekhai ben Hillel Hacoheh. The latter gave his column the title "Yis'ra'el we-arso be-hazon ha-sippurim" which appeared from the second volume onwards. In it he analysed the reflection of fate, destiny and the character of the Jews in the opinions of some story-writers, whether they were Jews or non-Jews. In addition to this column there were two other regular columns in this section: "Min ha-ma<sup>C</sup>arav" by Bernfeld in volumes 5-10 which was devoted to discussing literary aspects of European cultures, and "Ro<sup>C</sup>im we-<sup>C</sup>adarehem", by Ben Hillel Hacoheh which was occupied with discussions of Jewish cultural and political events.

The influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am on this section was conspicuous not only regarding the style but also in respect of the contents. This influence was exerted by the editor himself, especially if it was a question of correcting the language or the style, to such an extent that it was hard to tell where the actual words of a contributor start and where they end. On the other hand, if the views expressed were opposed to the views of the editor he used to add editorial remarks and comments if he were unable to persuade the writer to change his views before the article appeared in print.

The space allocated to the publicistic section in each issue varied from one issue to another according to the importance of events taking place in Jewish life. It was, however, between 25 and 35 pages in each issue.

### 3. Criticism:

During the time which preceded the publication of Ha-Shiloah Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was advised to devote a section in his monthly to book reviews, work which should be given to an expert critic. "In addition to teaching the reading public good taste, criticism also prevents the insolent youngsters of the generation from breaking through Hebrew literature and from doing all what they want to do." (18)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am followed that advice but the result was disappointing.

"At the beginning," he stated, "I intended to follow the method of European editors in giving books to several writers to review, but what was the result? Most of them promised to write, but did not fulfil their promises. Because they had promised I was not able to accept reviews of these books which I received from other writers, and because they did not carry out their undertaking I was robbed of both alternatives... So I stopped sending books to writers to review, hoping that someone might appear and review this book or the other." (19)

On another occasion Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wrote:

"There are no Hebrew critics for a book that requires thought and good professional knowledge of the subject. It happened last year that I had to seek the favour of writers and critics to review a book of that kind, but all of them evaded my request on different pretexts." (20)

One of these critics whom Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wished very much to attract to write regularly for Ha-Shiloah was Y.L. Kantor. In his critical work he carried on the

---

(18) In a letter from Mendele to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, Ha-Shiloah xl, 85.

(19) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.181.

(20) Ibid., vol. ii, p.21.



battle against provincialism in the contents of Hebrew letters and against the excessive Biblical euphuism of style. Kantor agreed to work for Ha-Shiloah on condition that nothing should be changed in his contributions without his approval. This agreement was breached when Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am erased the name of Klausner from an article criticizing the method of the latter in coining new words.<sup>(21)</sup> The consequences were not only that Kantor stopped writing for Ha-Shiloah - although he had already started three columns, the first two of them in the criticism section: "*Sefarim we-sofrim*," "*Zikhronot*" and "*Mikhtavim me-Rusiyah*" - but also that he criticized the editor in a strong letter in which he declared:

"It will not be possible for you to retain your sensitivity without inflecting shame on the name of an individual in your periodical. Furthermore, I would like to tell you that this virtue itself will spoil your work very much... If you want to mark your periodical with nobility, good taste, and the deliberateness of careful thought - may God bless you for this good intention, and we thank God who blessed us with such a redeemer for our language and literature which have been abused and whose beauty has been spoilt by youngsters. Only you should not exceed bounds in doing this, in other words nobility should not overcome the spirit of strong and vigorous criticism which must appear from time to time in a periodical."<sup>(22)</sup>

Kantor even cast doubt on the suitability of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am for the editorship because he could not tolerate strong language.

---

(21) M. Balshan (pseudonym): "*Siḥat ḥolín*", Ha-Shiloah i, 286.

(22) In a letter from Kantor to Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Ha-Shiloah xl, 85.

Another important contributor to this section was I.H. Rawnitzki. He was previously well known for a series of literary epistles entitled "*Qevurat Sofrim*" which he wrote jointly with Shalom Alekhem in the form of letters exchanged between Eldad (S.A.) and Medad (R.). The relationship between Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and Rawnitzki was so close that he trusted him to edit the belles lettres sections during the last year of his editorship. Indeed, he was even ready to pass the editorship of the periodical to him in order to free himself from the editorial burden and to devote his time to literary works.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and Rawnitzki shared the same views on political matters and on ways of developing the Hebrew language and literature. Rawnitzki was a regular contributor to Ha-Shiloah from the time that it started publication. His column was entitled "*Sefarim hadashim*" in volumes 3-6, and was changed to "*Yedi<sup>C</sup>ot sifrutiyot*" in volumes 7-10. Rawnitzki himself was an editor and publisher of several Yiddish and Hebrew periodicals. The most important of them was the miscellany Ha-Pardes of which three volumes were published in Odessa during the years 1892-1896. It could be regarded as a link between the miscellany Kaveret, which was edited and published in 1889 by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and Ha-Shiloah. In a letter to Rawnitzki Bialik wrote: "The historian who will write the history of our literature of the present period, the period of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, should start from your Ha-Pardes, it is to be considered as the vestibule to Ha-Shiloah."<sup>(23)</sup>

---

(23) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.134.

Rawnitzki's contribution to Ha-Shiloah was merely book reviews.

Another important critic was Klausner who edited the regular column "*Sifrutenu*" in volumes 7-10. In addition to that he wrote several critical articles of which the most important is one on S.D. Luzzatto in three instalments in volume 7.

The section on criticism included also several biographies by writers like R. Brainin and D. Kahana. Brainin was synonymous with modernism, fine literary taste and sound critical judgement. His aim was to acquaint Hebrew readers with the thought, literature and art of the West and to improve their literary taste. His essays were dominated by the debate on the orientation of Hebrew literature towards universal culture. Having been unsuccessful in his attempts, he agreed to work for Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Ahad Ha-Cam despite the gap between the views of both of them. In the first volume he published an article in four instalments on Y.L. Gordon in which he attempted to rob Gordon of his poetic laurels and even dared to state that he hardly deserved the title "poet". He was less severe in analyzing Smolenskin's novels in his second important article "*Smolenskin betor mesopper*" also in four instalments in volumes 3 and 7.

As for Kahana, he contributed a great deal not only to this section but also to most of the other sections in the monthly. He wrote some important

monographs and reviews of some books. The most important of his work in this section was the article "*Emet le-Ya<sup>C</sup>aqov*" in five instalments in volumes 5-6. In it he defended Ya<sup>C</sup>aqov Emden ben Zevi, the historian and writer of the 18th century, against the criticism of Benjamin Cohen in his article "*Rabbi Ya<sup>C</sup>aqov <sup>C</sup>Emden u-tekhunato*" which appeared in the fourth volume of Ha-Shiloah and did not pay enough respect to Emden in the opinion of Kahana.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am gave space in the first volume to a bibliographical column entitled "*Tevu'at ha-shanah*" and edited by H. Brody. It included a list of books published during that year in European languages on the Jewish science. This list which appeared twice in the first volume (pp.188-192, 473-477) was classified according to the subject. For unknown reasons this column did not appear in the following volumes despite the remarks at the end of the second list which indicated that more lists would follow. The column included also some comments on certain books.

Also in the first and in the second volume there was a regular column entitled "*Al ha-kol*" with the sub-title: "*Anashim-Ma<sup>C</sup>asim-Sefarim-Kitve' <sup>C</sup>et.*", (Personalities - Actions - Books - Periodicals). It included small critical remarks and comments on various topics, literary, social or political. From the third volume onwards the title was changed to "*Inyanim shonim*" and the "*Yalqut qatan*" of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was converted into separate column.

The section on criticism was to some extent richer in the first two volumes than in the following volumes. The range of pages allocated to it in each issue was between 18 and 32 pages.

#### 4. Belles lettres:

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was interested in literature only as a didactic medium; he therefore did not take interest in belles lettres although it was the favourite subject for the average Hebrew reader of that time. His reason for adopting this attitude was that the Jews were still poor in the resources essential for creating original bellettristic work.<sup>(24)</sup> To a great extent this was Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's personal view. He admitted that belles lettres had never appealed to him and that he read only the works of famous European writers. He lacked any aesthetic views on belles lettres. His comment on a critical article by Klausner was:

"There are some basic views in this article which I cannot accept. But because the author is not alone in adopting them, and many, especially among the youth are more venturesome than he is in this regard, therefore I consider it my duty to make room for his article and I will say what I have to say on this subject in a special article."<sup>(25)</sup>

This article however, was never published.

Most of the material in that section of Ha-Shiloah, whether it is prose or poetry, was accepted because of

---

(24) Kol Kitvê A.H., p.93-97.

(25) Ha-Shiloah, viii, 368.

its didactic nature and not because of its artistic value. For this reason this section lagged very much behind other sections not only in respect of the space allocated to it, but also because most of the works in it were by writers who played hardly any role in the development of Hebrew literature. An exception was a handful of writers who were notably of good standard and enjoyed the confidence of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am in the quality of their writing.

The first and the most prominent was Mendele Mokher Seforim. He published the Hebrew version of his most finished and his artistically most valuable work:

"Be-<sup>c</sup>Emeq ha-Bakhah" in Ha-Shiloah. It was not simply a translation from the Yiddish by the author himself, but a reformulation of the story which had been published first in Yiddish in 1865 under the title "*Das Wunschfingerl*" (the Wishing Ring). The story was written and published in instalments both in Yiddish and in Hebrew over many years. In its Yiddish form two chapters appeared in the first Yiddish literary annual Die Yiddishe Folksbibliothek which was edited and published by Shalom Alekhem. When Ha-Shiloah started its publication the author translated the Yiddish part at the request of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am:

"When I remembered you, my friend, and remembered my promise to support the monthly which you intended to publish shortly, I did not rest even for a moment until I had translated for you '*Das Wunschfingerl*' according to your wish." (26)

---

(26) In a letter from Mendele to A.H., Ha-Shiloah, xl, 85.

These chapters of the story, which went even further than the chapters published in Yiddish, appeared in volumes 1-4 and 7-8 during Ahad Ha-Cam's editorship. The instalments were interrupted several times either because of Mendele's poor health or because he was working for other periodicals. From 1903 Mendele started to extend the Yiddish story by translating from chapters which had appeared in Hebrew in Ha-Shiloah. The story in its Hebrew form was completed in Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Klausner.

In this story, as in most of his works, Mendele preferred to use post-Biblical language. He probably held that Biblical Hebrew is not suitable for expressing secular thoughts and describing day-to-day life. This attitude made him unique among his contemporaries. He helped to create a modern style and to enrich the language. He created a *Midrashic-Talmudic* style and then gave the development of new story-telling a great forward impulse. The style was remarkable for its flexibility; it brought to light the various sources of the language in a fashion which gave them harmonious unity. Although it is a distinguished literary style, yet it creates the illusion of a spoken language, the language of Mendele's heroes. Sometimes he had to twist in it pure Yiddish expressions in order to bring it closer to reality:

"As Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was unique in his publicistic style; so Mendele was unique in his picturesque style... It is not a Biblical or *Mishnaic* or *Midrashic* style but an amalgam in which all of them were absorbed and mixed beautifully to form the style of a living language." (27)

This story was directed against poverty and want in every form. In it he emphasized the need for social reform. The cardinal features were symbolized by him in the names of the three towns where the scenes of his novels and stories are laid: *Kesalon* (foolishness), *Betalon* (idleness) and *Qabsi'el* (beggary). His descriptions are vigorous and realistic; he sets out all the details of life in the ghetto in a very sarcastic manner perhaps with some exaggeration.

Mendele was one of the few writers whose works Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was not free to correct and change without their permission. Knowing Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's attitude towards belles lettres one may assume that he agreed to publish this novel either because he considered it as a faithful description of the Jewish life within the Pale of Settlement or because of Mendele's reputation as a Hebrew and Yiddish writer. He was aware of the respect of the reading public for Mendele; this would be beneficial for Ha-Shiloah and attract more subscribers. Perhaps it was for this reason that the editor agreed to publish the story at the very beginning of the first issue and was willing to continue this arrangement. (28)

---

(27) Rawnitzki, I.H.: Dor we-Soferaw, 1927, pp.81-82.

(28) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.114.



It was Mendele's habit to start his novels with an introduction in order to give the reader a clear idea of the subject of his work, its place and the nature of its hero. This introduction for the "Valley of Tears" appeared in six pages in the first issue of Ha-Shiloah; but it is not included in the story in his Collected Works. In this introduction the writer described how his hero "Mendele Mokher Seferim" happened to meet a stranger passing through Betalon. The two became friends and after returning home the stranger sent Mendele a story called "*Das Wunschfungerl*" which he had written in German. He asked Mendele to translate it into Hebrew and to publish it. Mendele in this story is therefore both the narrator and publisher.

This story constitutes a great work depicting Jewish life during the gloomy reign of Nicholas I in a critical but also in a humorous and sarcastic way. His language is clear and the ideas are expressed in a direct way. Mendele uses conversation between his heroes very rarely. Religion appears very little in the discussion, and Mendele does not refer much to the Bible, unlike most of his contemporaries.

Like all Mendele's stories, "*Be-<sup>C</sup>Emeq ha-Bakhah*" was received by the reading public with great appreciation and enthusiasm:

"When the issues of Ha-Shiloah started to reach us," wrote Fishman, "we used to search for - apart from the essays of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, and the poems of Bialik - first of all, the chapters of "*Be <sup>C</sup>Emeq ha-Bakhah*."

We learned them by heart like poems, despite the fact that we had read them before in Yiddish in the miscellanies of Shalom Alekhem."(29)

On the other hand, there were others who criticized it including the publishers. They found fault with the editor for accepting a work of this nature which, in their opinion, would have no benefit in educating a new generation of Hebrew readers. (30) Ahiasaf wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am:

"There are many subscribers who are not very pleased with Mendele's stories and wished to have instead more distinguished works... You should have avoided making room for his stories at the beginning of the issue... It is our fault that we did not tell you sooner the opinion of the readers on this matter. Everybody wishes to find, at the beginning of the issue, a publicistic article dealing with current events, but not a story."(31)

The second writer whose contribution to the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah had a great impact on Hebrew readers was the young and talented writer M.Z. Feuerberg. His first attempt to reach the columns of Ha-Shiloah was the sketch "Shadows". Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, however, did not like it, and wrote to the author: "'Shadows' did not satisfy me... I like the intelligible and direct words but not the symbolism and the wonderful phrases."(32)

Feuerberg looked upon Ha-Shiloah not only as a place in which he could publish his work but as a school

---

(29) Fishman, J. op. cit., p. 12

(30) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am: "Hasi Yovel le-se't Ha-Shiloah", Ha-Shiloah xl, 86.

(31) 'Arkhiyon A.H./38II/5.1.1897.

(32) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.232.

in which to be trained and to cultivate his talent.

In one of his letters to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am he wrote:

"Here I am sending my works for publication in Ha-Shiloah only because many of the outstanding Jewish writers have praised my literary talent and have foretold a good future for me, if I can only be industrious in developing my talent in a proper way. Moreover, the literature of the dailies - in which my sketches appear sometimes - is not capable of correcting the taste of writers by allowing them to be developed on their own responsibility and according to their ability. This type of literature is generally subordinated to the opinion of a reading public that is not yet able to appreciate any new idea or view which might be above the circle of humble life... Here I am with enough courage to send my work for publication in Ha-Shiloah.

I know that as it is the duty of every enlightened editor to improve the taste of his readers and to open for them the gates of a new world full of new life and new aspirations, so also it is his duty to take good care to develop the writer and to encourage and cultivate young talents."(33)

In Feuerberg's works one can hear the beat of a heart full of hope for a better future. Like most of his heroes he was dissatisfied with the older form of life and wanted a change, but he did not want a rift between the past and the future as the "Young Writers" demanded. In the story "Le-'an?" (Whither?) - his most important story in Ha-Shiloah - he emphasized that the complete harmony between the Jew in the man and the man in the Jew is possible only by the building up of a perfect Jewish centre in Palestine. Its hero was brought

---

(33) Kitvé M.Z. Feuerberg, p.157.

up upon the Talmud. After coming in contact with a broader knowledge and culture he revolted against its autocratic hold over Jewish life and minds. He would not be content with a few reforms in the tradition, but would seek an entirely new mode of existence for his people.

The story "Whither?" contains a high pitch of passion and psychological analysis which were foreign to Hebrew literature of that time. When Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am received the story his view was:

"There was a good idea in your mind but you did not have the patience to develop it properly to the end. At the beginning you worked on it with diligence and energy and at the same time you expanded more than what was required. But at the end when you reached the fundamental point... You became very exhausted and tried to shorten as much as possible. So the end appears like a hasty episode which has no clear connection with what preceded it... If you want to publish it in Ha-Shiloah I advise you to re-write the last part." (34)

When Feuerberg wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am asking him to specify what is to be changed in the story the latter replied:

"Things like these should not be done according to the instructions of others. They should be derived from the heart of the author himself. Generally speaking, your story lacks an internal unity... As for the death of the lunatic... if the course of his life had led him to the point of being unable to bear it, then his death should be caused by an internal reason, either because his madness had reached its climax and eventually led to his death, or he would commit suicide after realizing that this world is not a good place for him any more. But death from cold is an accidental reason which has no connection with his life." (35)

---

(34) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.205.

(35) Ibid., p.216.

Feuerberg gladly followed this advice and re-wrote the last part of the story; and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am added his own treatment to the style.

Apart from "Whither?" which appeared in instalments in the fifth volume of Ha-Shiloah, three other short stories by Feuerberg were published in earlier volumes - "Ha-<sup>c</sup>Egel" (the Calf) in volume 2, p.433, "Ha-<sup>c</sup>gamia" (the Amulet) in volume 4, p.336 and "Ba-<sup>c</sup>Erev" (in the evening) in volume 4, p.501. These sketches characterize the tragedy of a whole generation of young Jews whose life in the ghetto was both repellent and attractive to the author. This tragedy was in the form of inner conflict between tradition and modern education, between Jewishness and general knowledge.

Feuerberg was the writer who introduced the ideas of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am into fiction. For him Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was more than just an editor. He regarded him a supreme ideal from the day he started to read in modern Hebrew literature, and he remained an educator and instructor for him till the day of his death.<sup>(36)</sup> This respect was shown in all Feuerberg's letters to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. In one of them he declared: "Everytime I write to you I regard you not only as editor and publisher but also as an adviser and instructor. I am anxious to know the opinion of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am the writer more than the opinion of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am the editor."<sup>(37)</sup> He also authorized the editor to correct wherever he wished in his writings.<sup>(38)</sup>

---

(36) Klausner, J.: Yasrim u-vonim, vol. ii, p.181.

(37) Kitve Feuerberg, p.166.

(38) Ibid., p.154.

Feuerberg adopted and defended the attitude of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am in his controversy with the "Young Writers". He attacked Berdyczewski who claimed to be speaking on behalf of the young generation of Hebrew writers. In his "Letter to Berdyczewski", Feuerberg wrote:

"This generation, which like you has its own dreams, and sacrifices itself... so that a new and healthy generation will come, joyful and fresh, to the good earth - this generation looks upon you as its most terrible enemy and will fight you with all its strength and power." (39)

Feuerberg sent this article for publication in Ha-Shiloah but Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's opinion was: "You should keep yourself in the circle of belles lettres, because there is no doubt that there you will be able to create good things and to express your views in a style which is suitable for a bellettrist." (40)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am used his influence on Wissotzky to get some financial assistance for Feuerberg. His efforts succeeded in getting a monthly subsidy for the young writer for one year. (41)

H.N. Bialik was another eminent writer who was a regular contributor to this section of Ha-Shiloah. Most of his outstanding works which left their marks on the history of Hebrew literature were published in the ten volumes edited by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. Each of these works has been analyzed thoroughly elsewhere by Hebrew

(39) Ibid., p.139.

(40) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. ii, p.59.

(41) Ibid., p.150.

*Ad. back*

critics. However, because of Bialik's position as joint editor of Ha-Shiloah he will be discussed in a later chapter. (42)

The name Bialik will always remind many Hebrew readers of Saul Tchernichowsky. Tchernichowsky was not fully appreciated not only by Ahad Ha-CAm but also by most of his contemporaries; this was, no doubt because of his non-Jewish poems. In a letter to Klausner Ahad Ha-CAm summarized his attitude towards Tchernichowsky and his poetry as follows:

"If Bernfeld is doubtful about the originality of Jewish culture during the time of the Second Temple, it is only a small matter compared with the dangerous views which Tchernichowsky disseminates in his poems... The spirit of poetry which spreads views like these is acting like the relish which they mix with the fly killer." (43)

Only two of Tchernichowsky's poems were published in Ha-Shiloah during the editorship of Ahad Ha-CAm:

"*Ani ma'amin*" (I believe) in volume 2, and "*Ben ha-mesarim*" (Impasse) in volume 5. Two more poems were rejected, the first one "*Barukh mi-Magensa*" (Barukh of Mayence) had been disqualified by the censor, and the second "*Me-tokh 'av he-Canan*" (from the darkness of the clouds) was disqualified by the editor. e/

David Frischmann too was not properly represented in Ha-Shiloah. But in Frischmann's case it was he who resented working under the editorship of Ahad Ha-CAm and the only two poems which he published, both in the

---

(42) Bialik as an Assistant editor and contributor to Ha-Shiloah, chapter III, section 3.

(43) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.92.

first volume of Ha-Shiloah "Halom ha-Kalif u-Fitronow" (the dream of the Caliph and its interpretations) and "Mashiah" (Messiah), have hardly any artistic value. The first poem was described by the poet himself as a "vain ditty", and he promised to send Ha-Shiloah a good poem and a short story.<sup>(44)</sup> The story did not appear in Ha-Shiloah, and there is no evidence to show that it was even sent to Ha-Shiloah. The "good poem" was nothing more than "Mashiah", which was described by the editor as "good but lacking any metre or rhythm or even parallelism, and perhaps it would be better to publish it as vocalized rhymed prose."<sup>(45)</sup> Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am suggested alterations including changing the title into "Havle Mashiah", but his suggestion was not accepted.

There were two prominent Hebrew and Yiddish writers who were not even invited to work in Ha-Shiloah under Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's editorship. Their absence must be considered a great loss for its readers. These two writers were I.L. Peretz and Shalom Alekhem. In 1896, at the time of the establishment of Ha-Shiloah Berdyczewski wrote to Peretz to tell him, among other things, the opinion of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am about his literary production.

Peretz replied:

"You took the trouble to tell me about the opinion of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and others about me. I swear by my life that it does not make any difference to me whether they praise me or revile me, whether they honour or disgrace me. I do not write for the sake of honour or for commercial reasons. I write when the spider spins; this is my nature."<sup>(46)</sup>

---

(44) "'Iggerot Frischmann le-Berdyczewski", Moznayim, vol. vii, 1938, p.478.

(45) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.143.

(46) Meizel, N.: Sefer Y.L. Peretz, 1960, p.371.



In addition to what had been mentioned there were some stories and some sketches of great value, written by important writers like S. Ben Zion, Judah Steinberg, H.D. Horovitz and others.

A thorough investigation of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's published letters and the remarks included in them regarding literary technique and style - most of them accepted by his contributors - shows that the editor maintained a good literary sense despite his lack of appreciation of belles lettres.<sup>(47)</sup> The artistic value of most of the material which appeared in this section was poor. But this should not prevent the fair critic from confessing that Ha-Shiloah played an important role in educating a new generation of Hebrew readers and a new generation of Hebrew writers to meet the demands of the new age.

---

(47) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's own contribution to the development of Hebrew style is discussed below in "Excursus B."

### CHAPTER III

#### HA-SHILOAH IN THE SECOND PERIOD (1903-1919)

##### 1. THE APPOINTMENT AND POLICY OF KLAUSNER

The General Meeting of *Ahiasaf* was convened in Minsk in October 1902 to decide the future of the monthly. *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* submitted his resignation from the editorship of Ha-Shiloah and Klausner was appointed in his place. His name had been suggested to *Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* during that meeting and he did not object. However, the latter was shocked when he read in the minutes afterwards that "*Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* would not hand the editorship over to anyone except Klausner."<sup>(1)</sup> He protested to *Ahiasaf* in a strong letter in which he declared:

"I could not have allowed myself to force the management to choose some particular person. It was you who suggested Klausner and I approved. But if you had suggested anyone else who is not less learned and honest than Klausner I would also have approved - but you did not."<sup>(2)</sup>

*Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am* did not want to take a unilateral stand on this point so that he would not be blamed in case of disagreement with the new editor. His personal view was that Ha-Shiloah should be discontinued. In a letter to Bernfeld he wrote in this regard:

---

(1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.206.

(2) Ibid.

"*Ahiasaf* decided to continue the publication and to give the editorship to Klausner. For my part I do not object (although I would have been more pleased if *Ha-Shiloah* had ceased publication completely. After all, it will not live long, in my opinion, and it would have been better for it to cease publication now rather than to add to it some issues in a different spirit which would spoil its harmony). I am doubtful whether it will resume publication. Certainly you know that from the beginning of the new year two more new periodicals (*Ha-Sofeh* and *Ha-Zeman*) will appear in our country and our public cannot accept all this stream of favours."(3)

The obvious candidates for the editorship were Rawnitzki who was a permanent assistant of *Ahad Ha-CAm* and Bernfeld who was a close friend of *Ahad Ha-CAm* and a regular contributor to *Ha-Shiloah*. There were some other names like A. Druyanov, S. Levin, D. Frischmann and Bialik. *Ahiasaf* decided to give the editorship to the young Klausner who was only 27 at that time and had just finished his studies.(4) They informed him in a formal letter:

"Following the decision of our General Meeting to continue the publication of *Ha-Shiloah* during the next year and to economize in our expenditure to the amount of 2,000 roubles a year, we have decided on the recommendation of our fellow-members Z. Gluskin and M. Cohen to give you the editorship of *Ha-Shiloah* from the beginning of next year."(5)

*Ahad Ha-CAm* was very angry with *Ahiasaf* because they did not keep him informed about the affairs of the

---

(3) *Ibid.*, p.203.

(4) Pogrebensky, Y.: "Yosef Klausner ke-COrekh *Ha-Shiloah*", *Bitzaron*, xxxix, p.125.

(5) *Arkhiyon K.*/129/23.10.1902.

monthly - as its former editor - and of the company, as its official director. He complained in a letter to Kaplan:

"I was told that you have chosen Klausner as the new editor of Ha-Shiloah. If the previous editor need not be informed in your opinion - have I not the status of director of Ahiasaf and therefore should be informed about matters like this."(6)

Klausner was considered by his contemporaries as a leading disciple of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am although he himself denied being influenced by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am at any time. In his autobiography he declared:

"If I were really a student of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am I would not have been an ardent admirer of either Tchernichowsky during my whole life, or of Goethe, Heine, Byron and Schiller."(7)

Certainly Klausner was grateful to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am for allowing him to defend himself in Ha-Shiloah against his critics, and for accepting almost all that he submitted for publication in the periodical. Moreover, he was indebted to him for asking Wissotzky to support him when he was in financial distress even without the knowledge of Klausner himself.<sup>(8)</sup> But he did not accept the idea of being a student of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am.

His appointment met with strong opposition from some writers who considered him too inexperienced to become the successor of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. Frischmann wrote

---

(6) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.202.

(7) Klausner: Darki liqra't ha-tehiyyah we-ha-ge'ulah, p.56.

(8) Ibid., p.70.

an article for Ha-Zeman in which he criticized Ahiasaf for giving Ha-Shiloah to Klausner, but the editor of Ha-Zeman refused to publish it. A year later Frischmann resumed the publication of Ha-Dor and his criticism appeared in its first issue. He wrote:

"There has been a change of editors in Ha-Shiloah at the beginning of the year.

Its publishers have performed a small operation on it, as one of the critics has expressed it.(9) They have removed the brain and the heart; they have taken Ha-Shiloah from the hands of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am and handed it over to Klausner."(10)

It was a great honour ~~for~~ Klausner to succeed Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am as editor of Ha-Shiloah. He accepted the proposal with pleasure although he received only half the salary of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am.(11) He moved to Warsaw about the end of 1902 in order to be in easy contact with Ahiasaf. The prospectus of the new editor was sent to subscribers with the issue of November 1902. In it Klausner stressed the need for some changes in editorial policy as well as in the subjects of the material to be published. Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was annoyed when he saw the prospectus. He wrote to Klausner:

"I have found in it much confidence and excessively radical changes. I knew that your views on literature are different from mine, but I did not think that you would immediately change the character of Ha-Shiloah in this radical way."(12)

- 
- (9) Reference to the expression of H.J. Katzenelson in "Me<sup>C</sup>at sifrut", Ha-Zeman (Monthly) 1903, No. 18, p.7.  
 (10) Ha-Dor, 1904, No. 1, p.8.  
 (11) Klausner: Darki, p.100.  
 (12) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.214.

He was not pleased to see his policy in editing Ha-Shiloah and his views on literature criticized by some-one of the age and experience of Klausner. However, he decided to wait until the first issue was published, hoping that these changes may have been only for propaganda in order to attract more subscribers and contributors. Nevertheless, this did not deter him from expressing his attitude towards the policy of Klausner in a "Letter to the editor" published in the first issue.

The first issue of the new Ha-Shiloah appeared in January 1903. As in the previous period, the first article was about the new editorial policy, <sup>(13)</sup> which contained a detailed explanation of what had been set out briefly in the prospectus. Klausner opened by assessing the previous period of Ha-Shiloah and outlining its attitude towards political Zionism and the demands of the younger generation. He then stated:

"In our opinion, this was the main character of Ha-Shiloah in the past and it will remain in the future. Also in the future Ha-Shiloah will continue to fight not only against enemies but also against friends if they act or speak in an unworthy manner. Ha-Shiloah would like to remain as it has been - the inner cognition of the Jewish people... Particular attention will be paid to the aspirations of the younger generation who cannot be satisfied with the present situation of the Jewish people and who demand fundamental changes in its life and literature... In dealing with these new aspirations we shall not seek to compromise or to mediate between extremes, but it is the truth that we shall seek.

---

(13) "Megamatenu", Ha-Shiloah, Xi, 1-10.

After this statement Klausner gave a detailed analysis of the changes which he intended to introduce in Ha-Shiloah:

"When we force a Hebrew writer to discuss only what is attributed to Jewishness we are tearing away, at least one part of his mind... Thus if we say to Hebrew poets, for example, that 'mere poetry, lyrical effusions on the beauty of nature, the delights of love etc., our youth can seek in languages of other nations and they will find their fill of it'. (The Mission of Ha-Shiloah i, 5), we then force them to be unnatural by suppressing and subduing many sincere human thoughts and feelings which they really think and feel but for which they find no place in Hebrew literature... There is no device or tactic to overcome this obstacle but to remove completely the barrier which separates 'Jewish' aspects from 'general' aspects. This is what we intend to do in the new Ha-Shiloah!"

By doing that Klausner wanted to end the literary siege around Ha-Shiloah and to make a breach in the wall of the literary ghetto in which Ahad Ha-C<sup>o</sup>Am had maintained his journal. (14)

From this general change which would affect all sections of Ha-Shiloah Klausner moved to a more precise discussion of the changes to be introduced in the individual sections. He started with the section on belles lettres of which he declared:

"We would like to make another change which is not fundamental in Ha-Shiloah: we want to enlarge the section of belles lettres in it (obviously this will include poetry). We are not doing this, as others may imagine, solely to attract ordinary readers to Ha-Shiloah although there would also be nothing wrong in that; Ha-Shiloah is not designed for specialist

---

(14) Frischmann: Ha-Dor, 1904, No. 1, p.8.

scholars and we are, therefore, entitled to aspire and attempt to make it popular among a larger and wider reading public... We have decided to give the readers two quires full of poems and stories every month. If we succeed in publishing material of real beauty, free from any partisan propensities or tenderness, without much sentimentality and 'sweetness', without deep psychological analysis and without scratching and pecking at counterfeit feelings - only then we hope to come gradually closer to this great and important objective - to plant in the hearts of our readers deeper awareness that beauty, like thoughts and ethics, has a great value and that, therefore, beautiful poetical works are not only 'blossoms', but also 'fruits'."

In addition to stories and poems, Klausner also wanted to give in Ha-Shiloah one or two feuilletons every month.

This attitude was in complete contrast with that of Ahad Ha-Am towards belles lettres. The latter considered it non-creative and therefore of no importance for educating a new type of Hebrew readers.

As for the sections of publicistics and criticism Klausner wrote:

"On the sections of publicistics and criticism we shall not say much. Here we shall not change anything. We shall follow in the footsteps of the previous Ha-Shiloah except that we hope to be able to publish publicistic and critical articles more frequently on both Jewish and general matters. We do not want to give simply articles which could only enrich the table of contents, but we want to raise questions which should require solutions."

As for scientific and scholarly works, he promised to devote one quire in each issue to these subjects:

"These scientific and philosophical subjects will not be very popular because regretfully we realize that the popular science which the Jewish writers give to their readers is mostly, too deep for the ordinary reader and



too superficial for the scholar. We shall publish as much as we can find of real science and philosophy, not what is actually known by these names in our literature. On the other hand, we shall try to make sure that articles of this kind are comprehensive and extensive, that is to say, they will deal not with an isolated scientific or historical item but a complete phenomenon of Jewish or general history, of Jewish or general science."

Like his predecessor, the new editor stated that it was incumbent upon Hebrew writers to help in carrying out this programme. He predicted that these changes might not please all writers and readers

"but our comfort is that it is not possible and not necessary to please everyone. We cannot make Ha-Shiloah a 'public domain', or a 'place which is neither public nor private'. But also it will never be 'private property'; it will be at the disposal of truth, the truth as we understand the term."

He closed his article with a request that the readers should give him time before his programme could be carried out to the full. "All beginnings," he wrote, "are difficult; Hebrew writers who deserve the title are torn, particularly in these days, into twelve divisions, and our periodical literature is now in a state of ferment."

Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was the first to be displeased with these changes. It was obvious that Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Klausner would be the object of an immediate shift from the original policy established by Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. Their views on certain political and literary matters were contrary, and Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am must have expected some changed in the new policy of Ha-Shiloah. He was annoyed that Klausner had not informed

him of his intentions. Indeed, both were living at that time in Odessa and met regularly. He had expected to be consulted before any fundamental changes were made.

He wrote in a letter to Klausner:

"After all, Ha-Shiloah is my darling. I have the right to know what will happen to it in the future, especially if this concerns principles over which I fought my opponents hard, as you know, since the establishment of Ha-Shiloah; I have insisted on my opinions in this regard because they were my principles. So you should have expected from the beginning that it would distress me to see that Ha-Shiloah has been abandoned to ideas which it strongly opposed since the first day of its publication." (15)

It seems that Klausner wanted to act independently in editing Ha-Shiloah in spite of his belief that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's support was very essential for the success of the journal. In a letter to him Klausner wrote:

"I hope that you will justify our expectation and contribute to Ha-Shiloah more often. This is the only chance if it is to maintain its high standard and to retain its link with its previous readers and contributors. Your name has a great and strong magnetic power, and if you really want Ha-Shiloah to continue and succeed then you must support me. When I undertook the editorship I depended upon your assistance. Please do not abandon Ha-Shiloah. I am sure that it will never publish things which are not in accordance with your views." (16)

The first contribution by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to the new Ha-Shiloah was a "Letter to the editor", (17) in which he tried to evaluate his editorial work and to explain the

(15) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.220.

(16) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/8.1.1903.

(17) Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am: "Mikhtav 'el-ha-<sup>c</sup>orekh", Ha-Shiloah xi, 11.

reasons for his failure in accomplishing his aims. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am then moved to a more specific discussion on the new policy as outlined in the prospectus of the new editor. The first point of his argument was about belles lettres. He wrote:

"You say that you will pay more attention to the section of belles lettres and that you will allocate not less than two quires to it in each issue... Certainly I also paid attention to this section, but my attention was directed to quality and not to quantity."

As we have seen Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had accepted for this section what was considered in his opinion creative work in discussing aspects of Jewish life, while Klausner promised to leave the doors of Ha-Shiloah wide open for substantial work no matter what its subject was. Klausner also promised to give more space to poetry; this was against the principles of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am who regarded it as of little value for educating the people.

The second point of argument concerned the section of publicistics. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am replied to Klausner who promised to give in Ha-Shiloah more articles on Jewish and general matters:

"Here you have unintentionally touched the most painful wound in my heart, the result of my work in Ha-Shiloah. Publicistics is my profession, and it is no wonder that since the establishment of Ha-Shiloah I had always worked and desired to make this section excellent and perfect... There is almost none of the writers who are suitable for this work whom I did not approach and who did not agree to undertake one role or another in the publicistic section. But even the few who kept their undertakings prepared their work mostly in an imperfect way, and after some time they became tired and stopped collaborating altogether."

In fact Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am had tried desperately to make of this section the focus of Ha-Shiloah and his published letters provide evidence of his desire.

The last point was the reaction of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am to the attitude of the new editor towards literary criticism.

He wrote:

"You have promised to pay more attention from now on to literary criticism and to give scientific articles on Jewish and general matters which will discuss whole phenomena and original historical periods. How suitable this is when it is said as a promise for the future, and how much pain and sorrow reading these promises cause to the heart of the one to whom it is already a past! If you do not remember, you can read again what I have written in 'The Mission of Ha-Shiloah'

concerning science and criticism. Then you will know that for me too there was a specific ideal from the beginning to raise these sections to the highest possible degree of perfection. If reality did not help this ideal to be perfect - the reason for it was not bad intentions or lack of attention but rather the lack of our literary talents which are not enough to support generously and with honour even one monthly."

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am opposed the ending of the ban on non-Jewish aspects. His reason was that the new editor might not be able to fulfil his promises in the Jewish section for lack of talented writers - and in that case, his only alternative would be to increase the number of articles dealing with non-Jewish matters.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am finished his article with an appeal to the new editor to reconsider his decision concerning the radical changes in the policy of Ha-Shiloah.

He wrote:

"I think you still have enough time to reconsider the 'important changes' which you want to introduce in the form and substance of Ha-Shiloah. I know that if Ha-Shiloah would live for many years, the day will come when I shall not be able to recognize it and it will look like a stranger to me. This does not upset me at all. This should happen because that is the way of life. One generation departs and another comes, and each generation lives and works according to its own conventions. But the 'important changes', which happen from one generation to another - do not happen all of a sudden. I had hoped that this change in the character of Ha-Shiloah will also happen gradually with the necessary caution and in accordance with real need."

This criticism by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not pass without comment from the new editor. In his comment<sup>(18)</sup> Klausner tried to justify his changes. He stated that the answer to all the remarks of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am could be found in the new manifesto; it had been impossible to explain all the details in the prospectus. Unlike Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, the new editor believed in the ability of young writers to introduce general culture to Hebrew literature. For this reason he maintained that to devote the whole of Ha-Shiloah to a discussion of Jewish matters only would limit the horizon of the young generation, especially those who may want to write on general matters. Klausner claimed that his words on publicistics and criticism were not meant to put the previous Ha-Shiloah to shame, but to indicate that the new Ha-Shiloah would include discussion on general matters and articles on non-Jewish writers. Klausner stressed his desire to maintain the general character of Ha-Shiloah.

---

(18) "Teshuvat ha-<sup>c</sup>orekh," Ha-Shiloah, Xi, 15.

It would not be spoiled by some unimportant changes, and the only fundamental change would be the end of the ban on non-Jewish matters. He ended his comment by saying:

"If the heart of the new editor were not full of hope and confidence in the possibility of introducing a flow of new life to the previous Ha-Shiloah, he would not have borne the flag at all."

## 2. KLAUSNER AS CONTRIBUTOR AND EDITOR

The most dynamic Hebrew writer of the last decade of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century was Joseph Klausner (1874-1958). He was not only a literary critic but also philologist, biographer, essayist, translator, historian, publicist and writer on philosophical subjects and on Jewish religious matters. Here we may assess only Klausner's achievements as contributor to Ha-Shiloah.

Klausner's first appearance in Hebrew literature and in Ha-Shiloah was as a linguist. His first published work was the article "*Millim mehuddashot u-khtivah tammah*" in Ha-Mélish of 1893, and his first article in Ha-Shiloah was "*Marhive' ha-lashon u-mitnaggedehem*."

At the age of 19 Klausner published a treatise entitled "*Sefat C'ever safah hayyah*" in which he suggested some possible ways of widening the scope of the language. This treatise made of Klausner a target for some critics, and at the same time he became persona non grata to most of the contemporary periodicals. When Ahad Ha-C'Am established Ha-Shiloah he was anxious to restore Klausner's standing in the world of Hebrew literature. Ahad Ha-C'Am wrote to him: "I would like to publish something for you which would convince those who despise you that I do not agree with them."<sup>(1)</sup> And

---

(1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.229.

in another letter he declared:

"With all my heart I want to find room for an article which would bear your name after the disgrace which was brought on you lately by people who are anyway less learned than you. But what can I do if it is so difficult to divert you from the path of 'vociferousness' on which you are going and which - I hope I am mistaken - would lead you downwards and not upwards. To tell you the truth I am grieved to see a young man like you going in the wrong direction. You are talented and intelligent, and I am sure that you will become an honour to our literature in the future only if you do not believe that you already are."(2)

It was the article "*Marhive ha-lashon u-mitnaggedehem*" which brought Klausner back to Hebrew literature and Klausner remained grateful to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am for this.

Klausner is a fair representative of the younger generation of Hebrew writers in both their education and their aspiration to modernize the Hebrew language and literature and to harmonize Jewish life with general human culture. He adopted a compromise point of view between the old school of Hebrew writers represented by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and the new trend in Hebrew literature, championed by Berdyczewski to widen its horizon. Judaism and humanism was his slogan, and the unity of the two was his ideal.

Most Hebrew critics regarded Klausner as the disciple of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am who would judge things from the point of view of his master's precepts. Klausner himself confirmed the truth of this judgement when he stated: "You are my only teacher and instructor among all Jewish

2nd  
see above  
p 168



writers and scholars."<sup>(3)</sup> Describing the respect he and his own generation had for Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's writings, Klausner declared: "We regarded Mendele Mokher Seforim and Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as our educators and teachers; each of them assumed the authority of a master and allowed himself to rebuke the 'young devils' whenever he found it necessary."<sup>(4)</sup> Yet Klausner did not echo the thoughts of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am although he admitted the opposite.

"Berdyczewski said that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am influences only those who are close to him, while Smolenskin has influenced all the young generation and the reading public. I (Klausner) am your student in my thoughts, but in my style of writing I am Smolenskin's student... Without hypocrisy or flattery, there is none of our new writers whom I respect and honour as much as you."<sup>(5)</sup>

Klausner possessed marvellous erudition and a certain amount of historic insight, but he exhibited hardly any originality of thought. His treatment of belles lettres was primarily analytical but not sufficiently critical. His judgement was subjective rather than objective. He would give excessive space to small details. His contribution to Ha-Shiloah extended almost to all the literary branches except belles lettres. If we exclude the later period of Ha-Shiloah after it was transferred to Palestine, we find that his contribution exceeds over 110 articles, some of them

---

(3) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I/12.12.1900.

(4) Beqer, J. & Toren, H.: J. Klausner Hayyaw u-fo<sup>c</sup>alo;  
1947, p.232.

(5) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I/18.12.1896.

were of several instalments, on various subjects. In addition to that, there are his editorial remarks on the articles of other writers and the second part of his book Historiyah Yisra'elit which was published with special pagination in the last volume of the Russian period (vol. 36). Furthermore, there were regular columns to which he contributed tens of articles: "Sifrutenu" 14, "Hashqafah <sup>C</sup>Ivrit" 32, "<sup>C</sup>Olam Mithawweh" 21, "Qeren Zawit" 14, and "Ha-Ra<sup>C</sup>ayon ha-Meshihi" 10 articles.

According to Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's letters there was hardly any of Klausner's articles which Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am published without having corrected its style and even its language. Of the article "Yahadut we-'Enoshiyut" <sup>(6)</sup> Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am commented: "Its style is not good in many places and there is also exaggeration in its main idea." <sup>(7)</sup> Of the article "Te'udat Yisra'el", <sup>(8)</sup> he wrote: "Regarding the presentation and the arrangement of concepts, there are, as you have admitted yourself, many details which are not related to the subject, and the rational connection is not always successful." <sup>(9)</sup> Of another article Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wrote: "There are defects, and despite my willingness to change as little as possible, it is unlikely that I would leave it entirely as it is..."

---

(6) Ha-Shiloah ix, 331.

(7) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.124.

(8) Ha-Shiloah, vol. viii, p.385.

(9) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.74.

I ask you to avoid exaggeration in your future judgement on writers and books."<sup>(10)</sup> Another article by Klausner that met with the displeasure of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was his review of Lavh Ahiasaf for the year 1901. Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wrote to Klausner:

"As you can see, I do not agree with much of your criticism, therefore I cannot tell you now if and in what form I will publish your article. Nevertheless I will have to make many changes in it... If you do not agree I will return it to you because I cannot publish it as it is now."<sup>(11)</sup>

Klausner resented this treatment and in all his letters to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am he expressed his dissatisfaction with the corrections of the editor. In one of these unpublished letters, Klausner wrote:

"If the views of an editor on a certain story or article differ from those of his contributor, is that enough reason for the former not to publish the critical views of the latter?... Is it true, my friend, that in your opinion the editor and the critic must be of unanimous opinions even in the details of their views?"<sup>(12)</sup>

In another letter Klausner spoke on behalf of all the contributors of Ha-Shiloah and his words were very much in line with the criticism <sup>by</sup> Berdyczewski of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. Klausner said:

"I have asked you, and I am asking you again not to increase your omissions. Please do not alter unless it is really necessary. Give us some freedom, some width. Give us the chance to appear in front of the reader's eyes with our own

---

(10) Ibid., p.54.

(11) Ibid., p.90

(12) Arkhiyon A.H./868I/1901.

style as individual writers who are not similar to each other... Why do you want the artificial English garden whose trees are all cut and trimmed and alike in appearance and in form. Make of Ha-Shiloah a forest, grow a wild garden, where strong and old trees would grow side by side with the tender seedlings, where not all the trees would be similar but each one is different in shape and in appearance. Give us the chance to be what we really are so that nobody could say that in every article in Ha-Shiloah part is more or less the work of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am the editor."(13)

Like most of the contributors to Ha-Shiloah, Klausner, then, was constantly complaining about the damage which had been done to his articles by the editor's omissions. But unlike most of them, he was grateful to the editor at least for correcting his style. When Klausner received the last issue of the second volume and saw his article "*Yesod ha-tenu<sup>C</sup>ah ha-hadashah be Yiśra'el*" he wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am:

"You omitted (especially in its first part) the most original elements and the strongest words. There is no life in it now. There is no strength, no elucidation and no new ideas. By omitting one word you have weakened a whole page... You do not give room to originality and the individuality of each writer. It is obvious that you should omit what could be noxious in your opinion, but why don't you leave what could be very strong in your opinion, at the responsibility of the writers? The common complaint of all the readers of Ha-Shiloah is that there is no life in it, there is no wealth of colours, no multitude of light and shadows at the same time... Nevertheless, I am grateful to you for one thing: for corrections in style which are almost all very good, and I have learnt a great deal from them."(14)

---

(13) Ibid., 12.12.1900.

(14) Ibid., 18.6.1897.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's answer to his continuous complaints was:

"If you choose one of your articles which appeared in Ha-Shiloah and another which had been published somewhere else, and give them both to an intelligent reader with European taste - he will tell you which one of them is nearer to the European form of literature."(15)

It was Klausner himself who authorized Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am to alter and correct what needed correction. When he heard that Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was to take Bernfeld as co-editor he wrote to him: "If Bernfeld were to become editor of Ha-Shiloah or even of its publicistic and scientific sections, I very much doubt whether I could continue to write for Ha-Shiloah."(16) This arrangement was not successful and instead Rawnitzki was appointed associate editor with part-responsibility for reading and correcting author's manuscripts. When Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am informed Klausner that thenceforward his articles would be corrected by Rawnitzki, his answer was:

"You say that you cannot promise to edit my articles yourself and that you may pass them on to Rawnitzki. My friend! You probably know that false modesty is worse than boastfulness, so I think I can tell you all that is in my heart. I cannot digest the feeling that Rawnitzki will be the editor and will correct my articles. I like the man and I know his worth and I feel my deficiencies. Nevertheless I do not think that Rawnitzki outstrips me in literary talent, in scientific and literary knowledge or even in good literary taste. I will never allow Rawnitzki to correct

---

(15) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.279.

(16) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I/17.1.1902.

or to omit any thing in my articles, only you, and no other Hebrew writer in the world, are allowed to do this. Therefore please let me know if you would not be able to edit my articles yourself. If this is so, I regret to say that I will leave Ha-Shiloah." (17)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am not only changed and corrected Klausner's articles, he even rejected some of them. The article "*Hishtalmut<sup>c</sup> iyonit*" was not accepted because, "in its present form it lacked theoretical perfection," (18) while the article "*Milhamah be-shalom*" was rejected because "in my opinion you have passed several judgements without supporting them with substantial evidence." (19) This treatment, however, did not drive Klausner away from Ha-Shiloah because he considered it to be the only journal for a talented Hebrew writer.

Despite the contrast between the personalities of both the master and his disciple, and their opposing views of the methods of developing the Hebrew language and literature, there was no issue of Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am which did not include, at least one article by Klausner. Moreover, he was given a regular column for literary criticism during the last two years of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's editorship; he called it "*Sifrutenu*". The articles of this column were collected later in his book Yoserim u-vonim.

From Klausner's point of view, it was necessary to modernize Hebrew literature in order to attract more

---

(17) Ibid., 14.2.1902.

(18) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.54.

(19) Ibid., vol. ii, p.113.

readers. He stated:

"We complain about the decrease in the number of Hebrew readers, and we always think that the reason is only the decrease in the number of those who study Hebrew. But only few of us realize the sad fact that many youngsters who studied Hebrew in their childhood and read it easily, do not. They do not read Hebrew literature because it does not attract them. It is true that they need to read in Hebrew what is related to Judaism, but they do not want this Judaism to be in distress and poverty. They do not want Judaism to be merely a supplement to humanism but an integral part of it, a Judaism which could feed their minds and their hearts with new knowledge. Only then will there be no division in their hearts." (20)

Klausner's task in his literary work was to show how it was possible to produce a living literature dealing with subjects closely connected with life, in a language in whose rebirth none of the writers of the period believed. He believed that the key to the solution of this problem lay in a completely comprehensive presentation of the literature in all its aspects, belletristic, publicistic, scholarly, various forms of popular scientific literature and especially the gradual development of diction and style. In doing that he was practising what Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was preaching:

"For the achievement of his great purpose of raising up a new generation, of renewing the nation in exile, Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am proposed two principal means: education and literature. These two are needed gradually to root out, not only the assimilationist but also the weakness in the Jewish character which are the result of various historical causes. But the synthesis between Judaism and

---

(20) Klausner, J.: "Yahadut we-'Enoshiyut," Ha-Shiloah IX, 337.

humanism was imperfect. In Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's writings one feels that the scale is weighted on the side of Judaism."(21)

This was considered by Klausner as a defect in Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's doctrine and therefore he tried to avoid it (as mentioned previously). It was also for that reason that he preferred Tchernichowsky to Bialik:

"Klausner regarded Bialik as the mighty voice of his people but considered his lack of universal interests as weakness. He pointed out that Bialik never dealt with nature or love, nor did he reflect an appreciation of the genius of other peoples. Klausner even criticized Bialik's language for its lack of innovations. In Klausner's view Bialik represented the close of an epoch but not the beginning of a new one."(22)

Unlike Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, Klausner believed that the development of Hebrew should be in the hands of professional linguists with perfect knowledge of its grammar and its various styles and stages from the Biblical time onwards. He therefore devoted much of his time and energy to writing about linguistic aspects. Furthermore, he edited two miscellanies entitled "Sefatenu" (the first was published in Odessa in 1917 and the second in Jerusalem in 1943) and were devoted entirely to a discussion of ways of reviving Hebrew. He also published two linguistic treatises, the first was "Ha-lashon ha-<sup>C</sup>Ivrit lashon hayyah" and the second was "Transcripsyah <sup>C</sup>ivrit", as well as a book entitled

---

(21) Klausner, J.: A History of Modern Hebrew Literature, p.128.

(22) Kling, S.: Joseph Klausner, 1970, p.40.



"*Ha-<sup>C</sup>Ivrit ha-hadashah u-va<sup>C</sup>yoteha*" which included most of his articles dealing with linguistic topics.

Klausner had to choose between two opinions. On the one hand, he could follow the line of those who wanted to Europeanize Hebrew by admitting all the foreign words and expressions without putting them into Hebrew patterns. On the other, he could revive the language's Semitic basis by giving priority to Arabic and Aramaic terms, and introducing new meanings for Biblical and *Talmudic* words which were not in use, and creating new words and verbs from similar roots. Klausner followed the second line. He was not against the use of international expressions so long as there was no Hebrew alternative; when one was suggested, he freely welcomed it. He did not favour the use of Biblical style if there was a substitute in later periods. The following examples which are extracted from his book "*Ha-<sup>C</sup>Ivrit ha hadashah u-va<sup>C</sup>yoteha*" will show how important was Klausner's role in the development of Hebrew:

1. Words coined by Klausner:

ירחון , חלצה , זקיפה , מזריקה , מנוף , עפרון .

2. Words and verbs which he restored from previous periods:

מגדרת , שפופרת , מחצב , גחכן , חניכה , מתמיה , ריחני ,  
עולגול , גשש , סטר , תחליף .

3. Words from previous periods to which Klausner gave new usage:

ראשוני , חושני , חדגוני , רבגוני , הגדרה , פתיון , מטען .

4. Words coined by Klausner but replaced afterwards by more successful words:

צבורה	The word for this meaning is now:	קבוצה
לבתי	" " " " " " "	חזיה
מדינות	" " " " " " "	קסט
מסגרת	" " " " " " "	מסלול
בדוח	" " " " " " "	בדיחה

5. Words which Klausner introduced from the *Talmud* but were not accepted:

גנונה	The word for this meaning is now:	שמשיה
צליח	" " " " " " "	צלחת
כרובשת	" " " " " " "	מנהץ
שמהר	" " " " " " "	החש ד"

As for Klausner's editorial activities, it is not possible to give as full an account of these activities and his relationship with his contributors as was the case with *Ahad Ha-Cam*. Unlike *Ahad Ha-Cam*, Klausner was not in the habit of keeping copies of his own letters or the letters which he received from others in his capacity as editor. Even the few letters which have survived and which are now in his archives in the National and University Library of Jerusalem do not help greatly.

When Klausner was appointed as the successor to *Ahad Ha-Cam* in editing Ha-Shiloah his first case was, as we have remarked, to remove the barrier against non-Jewish literature and to increase the share of belles lettres in the periodical. He changed the sub-title of

the monthly from סכתב-עתי חדשי למדע, לספרות ולעניני החיים  
into ירחון לספרות, למדע ולעניני החיים

This change showed that the new editor gave priority to belles lettres over scientific literature, which had been the main section under the editorship of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. Klausner believed that good belles lettres is no less important than other forms of literature in the education of the people. In doing this Klausner proposed to give his readers what they liked to read; the policy of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am had been to give his readers what they should read. Klausner welcomed those whose literary concepts were not very pleasant to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. The poems of Tchernichowsky which had been considered by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as trash were proudly presented by Klausner even on the first pages of the issues. Klausner aimed too at changing the scientific section in Ha-Shiloah into pure science instead of the popular science of which Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was fond. Klausner wrote in a letter to Kaminka:

"I have tried hard to give in Ha-Shiloah scientific articles worthy of the title, but until now I have had little success. I did not want to publish in it popular scientific articles of the kind of Bernfeld's articles, but who writes real scientific articles in Hebrew at the present time?"(23)

Regarding his attitude towards the young writers Klausner declared:

---

(23) Genazim, vol. ii, p.158.

"I considered it my duty that as long as Ha-Shiloah existed there was no young writer whom I did not cultivate. If I received an article, story or poem from a famous writer and another from a beginner I chose the latter, for the famous writer can wait."(24)

One of these beginners was Asher Barash who wrote afterwards about Klausner:

"I have worked now with many editors, each of whom has his advantages and his disadvantages. But in Klausner I found one characteristic which is not in any other editor. He likes and respects whatever he publishes. He always does his best to defend and favour it even if it is weak and spoilt. This fact gave his contributors always a feeling of confidence. He also used to write to them in detail explaining whatever comment he may have made. This lively contact with writers has a great advantage: Klausner used also to make sure that his contributor was not deprived of his honorarium even if it was very little."(25)

When Klausner took over the editorship, he thought that his own youth would enable him to meet the demands of the younger generation.

"He was confident in his own ability and in the capability of his contributors, and he had faith in the certain future of the Hebrew literature, in the broadening of the language and its development as a spoken tongue, and in the fatherly and devoted cultivation of tender talents."(26)

But he failed to satisfy all readers and writers. Some prominent literary figures did not like the idea of having him as the successor of Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am in editing Ha-Shiloah; either they wanted the post themselves or

---

(24) Klausner, J. Darki, p.100.

(25) Kitvé Asher Barash, vol. iii, p.35.

(26) Baqer & Toren, op.cit., p.214.

they thought that Klausner's appointment would lessen the respect of readers and writers towards Ha-Shiloah. One of the critics of Klausner's policy was Frischmann who wrote:

"Instead of Ha-Shiloah being until last year devoted only to Jewish matters, Klausner will no longer differentiate between Jewish and general matters. Moreover, the new editor promised to improve the sections of belles lettres, publicistics and criticism and to publish one or two feuilletons in each issue. So far most of these promises have not been fulfilled. However it is still possible that some of them may be fulfilled. Ha-Shiloah has not yet completed a year, and so far only ten issues have appeared. So there is still hope for the remaining two." (27)

Because of this criticism Klausner had to write an editorial remark in the last issue of his first volume (28) in which he argued:

"I knew from the beginning that the new Ha-Shiloah would not find favour in the eyes of our critics, and I do not think it is necessary to answer here all those who criticized almost all that has been published in Ha-Shiloah... what can I say, for instance, to critics who complain that Ha-Shiloah is not Zionist because it criticizes the work of the Zionist leadership, or to those who do not consider "Levivot mevushshalot" of Tchernichowsky as dreadful tragedy describing the destruction of an old generation by a new one, but as an attempt to describe how cakes can be prepared... What can I say to the critic who thinks that the style of "Meshelanu" is the same as that of "Megalleh temirin", and that the main object of my article on Yiddish was to denounce Zionism? However, my attention was drawn by several readers and writers to two important points: First, they complain that Ha-Shiloah is poor

---

(27) Ha-Dor, 1904, No. 1, p.8.

(28) "Teshuvat ha-Corekh", Ha-Shiloah, xi, 597.

in publicistics. It seems to me, however, that they are mistaken because they do not differentiate between a daily and a monthly. In a daily, any small event could and should be the subject of a short publicistic article which is enough to fill the front page of the daily issue. It is obvious that such articles have no place in Ha-Shiloah.

This leaves us with the really important events which cause excitement and raise important questions. About these exceptional events there have appeared some long publicistic articles... On the rest of the events which are of little significance, the reader will find detailed discussion either in the "Hashqafah kelalit" or in the "Hashqafah Ivrit" which are in each issue. It must be understood that these reviews are not simply chronicles for recording events, but they are pure publicistic articles which throw light on the causes and consequences of these events."

"The second complaint is that I did not increase the number of articles dealing with general aspects in this volume as I had promised... I did not promise to give the readers of Ha-Shiloah a certain number of articles discussing general aspects in each volume. If I did that, Ha-Shiloah would have become a collection of 'borrowed instruments', and that is what Ahad Ha-Cam was afraid of. I would have been able to publish discussion on many general aspects if I had allowed the publication of free translations from Russian and German periodicals, or lectures which are adaptation of non-Hebrew articles on Gorky, Chekov or Nietzsche... Such articles I did not and would not accept. I only promised that if I received suitable literary material dealing with non-Jewish aspects, I would not reject it on the ground that it does not deal with Jewish matters, and this promise I have already fulfilled... I shall not give any more promises but I will do my best to fulfil the old ones. This can be achieved only by the co-operation of Hebrew writers."

This hostile attitude of some Hebrew readers and writers towards Ha-Shiloah under Klausner may have been due to the firm stand of the monthly against political Zionism. Klausner complained of this attitude when he wrote later: "They forget all that they said against

Ha-Shiloah of Ahad Ha-CAm... When he was editor they criticized him, but when I became the editor all the criticism was turned against me."<sup>(29)</sup> The influence of Zionism on Hebrew literature of that time was explained in a letter from Bialik to Klausner. In it he wrote:

"It seems to me that the reading public has no desire to read anything but nationalistic literature for the simple reason that now is not the time for literature but rather for action. Therefore a daily is more appropriate to the requirements of the time, while a monthly is the journal for a calm period and for widening the knowledge."<sup>(30)</sup>

This attitude was confirmed in a letter from Us~~S~~ishkin to Klausner blaming him for ignoring current events and discussing purely scientific matters in volume 14. He asked: "Is this the time for dealing with matters like the Queen of Sheba?"<sup>(31)</sup>

About the beginning of 1905 Bialik was on a visit to Odessa where he had a chance to learn the judgement of the reading public on Ha-Shiloah. He wrote in a letter to Klausner:

"I never believed that Ha-Shiloah could be unsatisfactory to the extent that I found in Odessa. Everyone complains of the dryness of its articles, of its lifelessness and of its being restricted within a narrow circle of subjects which have no connection with present-day life. They all assured me that most of the serious articles in Ha-Shiloah are not read."<sup>(32)</sup>

---

(29) Klausner; Darki, p.100.

(30) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.292.

(31) 'Arkhiyon K./127/6.6.1904.

(32) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.285.

Klausner was not at all glad to read these remarks and his answer was:

"I tell you with confidence that these people do not know what they want. What do they miss in Ha-Shiloah? Publicistic articles?

Publicistics are of more concern to a daily... However, Ha-Shiloah gives publicistic articles on the most important events, but such events are not many. On the other hand, many of the simple current events which are really popular, are not the subject of monthly articles but rather of press reports; yet Ha-Shiloah

discusses them from time to time in the "Hashqafah <sup>C</sup>Ivrit". I would rather agree to suspend the publication of Ha-Shiloah than

to close its doors to the articles of writers like Neumark, Hayyoth and Lipschitz. I am afraid that all the anger of the Odessons against Ha-Shiloah is only because they dislike me, the

editor of the serious dry section... There are many good stories and poems in Ha-Shiloah;

one would not find better than them in any of the dailies, the literary miscellanies or the Hebrew monthlies."(33)

Some writers resented the editorial corrections by Klausner in their work. Brenner said in a letter to A. Zion: "Do not send any more publicistic articles to Ha-Shiloah because they lose their individuality there."(34)

This attitude of his readers and the heavy editorial duties led Klausner to regret accepting this post. In a letter to Bialik he wrote:

"You cannot imagine how hard and how difficult is the editorial work for those who take it seriously; it is bearable only when there are contributors whose works do not need to be corrected from beginning to end."(35)

---

(33) Ungerfeld, M.: Bialik we-sofre' doro, p.273.

(34) Kol Kitve' Brenner, vol. iii, p.311.

(35) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.264.



Commenting on a similar complaint Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote to Klausner:

"What you have said about your editorial work has saddened me despite the fact that I expected it all and told you from the beginning that editorial work is far more difficult than you may have imagined."(36)

Although Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was not satisfied with the editorial policy of Klausner he considered Ha-Shiloah the only place in which to publish his own works.

In a letter to Kaplan he wrote: "No doubt you know that in the absence of Ha-Shiloah there will be no room for me in Hebrew periodical literature."(37) This feeling towards Ha-Shiloah gave him certain privileges which he previously denied to others. He allowed himself to demand that his articles be published in certain issues or even on certain pages of the issue. He requested that they should be published without any changes or corrections by the editor and that he would be allowed to publish them simultaneously in Ha-Shiloah and other periodicals.

Klausner considered the contribution of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to Ha-Shiloah essential for its success. When he assumed the editorship he kept Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's name on the issues as founder of the monthly. The latter did not agree to this and asked Klausner not to continue inserting his name on the wrapper. Klausner was reluctant to do this for fear that it might leave the impression that the

---

(36) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.224.

(37) Ibid., p.345.

new editor wanted to free the monthly from the spiritual influence of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am; the effect might be a decrease in the number of its readers. However, he submitted to Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's wish on condition that the latter would write regularly for Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(38)</sup>

Klausner described the importance of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am for the success of his periodical when he wrote to the latter saying:

"Ha-Shiloah is not the same without you.

It is considered as a journal of constant and clear course. It is necessary therefore that this course be emphasized in each issue. This would be possible only by giving publicistic articles in it, but since you do not write I am left alone in the battle field."<sup>(39)</sup>

In 1905, many people promised to support Klausner in his attempts to resume the publication of Ha-Shiloah only if they knew that Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am favoured the periodical in its present form. Klausner wrote to him and declared:

"I do not know why, but there is a rumour among your admirers and among many readers that you are not satisfied with the present Ha-Shiloah - despite the fact that you publish your articles in it. I am sorry if this is true... On the one hand, they criticize Ha-Shiloah for being the organ of Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, and on the other they criticize it for being an organ which does not satisfy Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am."<sup>(40)</sup>

It is true that Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am considered Ha-Shiloah as the only place in which to publish his articles, but it is equally true that he was not satisfied with the

---

(38) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/11.3.1903.

(39) Ibid.,/4.1.1904.

(40) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.224.

*Arkhiyon A.H./868II/8.8.1905*

changes in its character. When Klausner published Tchernichowsky's idyll "*Levivot Mevushshalot*" at the beginning of an issue (volume XI, p.97) *Ahad Ha-CAm* was indignant and wrote to him:

"The question of publishing Tchernichowsky's poem at the beginning of the issue has left a very bad impression on me. If you are changing the character of Ha-Shiloah in matters concerning ideology then it might be possible to argue that you have to work according to your inner conviction. But if it is only a matter of what stands early or late in the layout of the issue, then there is no room for 'inner conviction' to force you to change what has been a permanent system since the establishment of Ha-Shiloah."(41)

Klausner was also criticized about this change in both the Hebrew periodical Ha-Zeman and the Russo-Jewish periodical Voskhod.

Klausner made it clear that he intended to start the issues, not with scientific articles as *Ahad Ha-CAm* used to do, but with purely literary articles or sketches because, he maintained, the monthly is mainly a literary one. He wrote in a letter to *Ahad Ha-CAm*:

"Beleve me, I did not do that deliberately to alter the system which you followed. What happened is that I do not want to publish scientific articles at the beginning of the issues because this is not the case in any other literary monthly. Why should I deceive myself if Ha-Shiloah is more literary than scientific? I wanted to give publicistic articles at the beginning of the issues but what can I do if I do not receive a good publicistic article every month. There is no alternative but to give stories and sketches at the beginning of the issue, and this is what I intend to do in the future."(42)

---

(41) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.224.

(42) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/20.3.1903.

Although this was only a technical matter yet it shows how wide was the gap between Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am and Klausner in their attitude towards the development of Hebrew literature and in their appreciation of belles lettres. When Klausner asked for Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's opinion of his editorial work, the latter replied:

"I have just finished reading your second issue and I regret to tell you that it did not satisfy me. Apart from the article by D. Neumark and your own article on 'cuneiform' (which in an issue like this, gives a strange impression as something out of place) I did not find anything satisfactory. The belles lettres are not very good and yet you fill most of the pages of Ha-Shiloah with them to no purpose.

The article of Ehrenpreis is full of phraseology but it is hard to find any clear concept in it, and you should have omitted his harsh words against the literature of the last century."(43)

Furthermore Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am' described the belles lettres as of medium quality or even worse.

Klausner's comment on this criticism was:

"I am very sorry to see that you think a few lines are enough for a complete assessment of my great and hard work on the second issue of Ha-Shiloah. Moreover, I am sorry to know that you consider good pearls like "Genihah" (a sketch by J. Steinberg) "Zegenin" (a sketch by S. Ben Zion) and "Mah shemo" (a sketch by Y.L. Peretz) as belles lettres of medium quality or even worse... All the stories which I have published seemed important and original to me and that is why I published them."(44)

In 1910, some of the Hebrew writers who had immigrated to Palestine wrote to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am asking him to interfere in order to ensure the success of the monthly. His answer was:

---

(43) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.230.

(44) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/5.4.1903.

"You seem to believe wrongly that my influence on Ha-Shiloah is still as great as it was, to the extent that it is for me to choose its place and to outline its policy. In fact this is not the case. For some time now Ha-Shiloah has been outside the circle of my spiritual influence and I have had no responsibility for it. During the last few years many things (especially in the belles lettres section) were published in it that did not satisfy me at all, but the editors did not consult me and did not think it is their duty to take into consideration the character of Ha-Shiloah during its previous years." (45)

Two months later he wrote to Klausner saying:

"I have read the belles lettres in the last issue of Ha-Shiloah and I am truly glad that it does not contain that rudeness and obscenity which had been familiar in Ha-Shiloah during the last few years. But it seems that even now you still think it is your duty to pay tribute to the young writers. Nothing else can explain why you give space to works which do not contain anything except 'mist', phrases full of 'allusions' to a world which is above the mind and the simple life of mankind." (46)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am maintained the opinion that Ha-Shiloah had proved to be unacceptable to the majority of Hebrew readers and therefore was not worth further sacrifice. This was his opinion when Klausner was offered a teaching job in St. Petersburg - on the suspension of Ha-Shiloah from publication in 1905. In a letter to Klausner on the same matter Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am wrote:

"Surely you remember that when the proposal of St. Petersburg was on the agenda I advised you to accept it. Perhaps you were surprised at that time to see my cool attitude towards the existence of Ha-Shiloah. Bearing in mind the

---

(45) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iv, p.245.

(46) Ibid., p.261.

picture you gave me about the editorial work - which I knew very well from my own experience - I said then to myself: Who knows if Ha-Shiloah is worth the sacrifice of your talent, and if our literature should lose a writer like you for the sake of Ha-Shiloah... if you find more suitable work for the development of your talent, even if this will mean suspending the publication of Ha-Shiloah, I would not regard it as wrong on your part if you were to accept it."(47)

Even when the new publishers of Ha-Shiloah succeeded in obtaining subscriptions from more than 3,000 readers in 1907, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's opinion did not change. He wrote in a letter to Rawnitzki: "Your news about the subscription to Ha-Shiloah did not please me very much. I asked myself what will happen next year when the present enthusiasm is gone."(48)

In spite of this financial success Klausner shared Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's worries about the future of Ha-Shiloah; he asked for his advice on the best way to make it acceptable to the majority, and not only to the élite of Hebrew readers, even if this would mean handing it over to another editor. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's answer was:

"I think I have told you once that Ha-Shiloah should be what it was or else cease to exist. Certainly Ha-Shiloah is not a periodical devoted to Jewish science and neglecting current affairs; on the other hand, it has never been only a battlefield, and could never be. If the reading public has no desire now for a journal like Ha-Shiloah - then it will leave it and seek another alternative. But how could you believe in the possibility of reducing Ha-Shiloah

---

(47) 'Arkhiyon K./128III/23.8.1911.

(48) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iv, p.68.

to the standard of a mouthpiece for a certain faction by involving it completely in the polemics of the present time - and to suggest that it needs only another editor who could do that? On the contrary, it must not be handed over to any other editor for this particular reason - it would be better for Ha-Shiloah and for us to suspend publication again until its time comes."(49)

Again, at the end of 1910, it occurred to Klausner to transfer the monthly to Jerusalem and to take a teaching job there beside his editorial work. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's opinion was:

"It would be wonderful if you could disseminate knowledge in Palestine and edit and publish Ha-Shiloah there at the same time... But I doubt it if Ha-Shiloah could survive there. Ussishkin is doing his best now to ensure its existence and he supervises the practical side of the business from close by. But if Ha-Shiloah is edited (and obviously published) in Palestine, I am afraid that the distance - even if it is in Palestine - might lead also to forgetfulness and carelessness about its existence in Russia."(50)

A year later Klausner suggested some changes in order to ensure the success of Ha-Shiloah. When, however, he informed Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, the latter replied:

"Regarding your question about editing Ha-Shiloah I regret to tell you that I cannot be of any help. When I was the editor I tried all the methods which you have mentioned, but with no success... The condition of our literature does not leave any possibility for sharing the work in this regard. The editor should be the sole judge of all the editorial work and therefore an assistant will not be of much help. I also do not see the change of place as

---

(49) Ibid., p.82.

(50) Ibid., p.298.

a possible solution. I edited Ha-Shiloah in Berlin and afterwards in Odessa, but I do not recall any difference in the work. But to hand Ha-Shiloah entirely to another editor - this is certainly the best way to discharge yourself if this is your wish. The question is who could be the other one?"(51)

Klausner made another attempt in 1912 to move with the monthly to Palestine following his first visit there, but Ussishkin dissuaded him from immediate emigration because Ha-Shiloah could not be published easily from Palestine. (52)

Ha-Shiloah continued to appear successfully in Odessa with the help of its 2,000 subscribers even during the first year of the First World War despite all the difficulties. During the second year this number decreased while expenses increased due to the high price of paper and the high charges of printing. It also had problems with the censorship. During the first Russian revolution 1904-1905 there had been pre-publication censorship but this system was abolished in October 1905. During the First World War the military censor began to look for a way to disrupt the publication. He demanded that the editor of Ha-Shiloah should submit a precise Russian translation of all the material to be published in the journal. Previously the rule was that only suspected material should be sent to the censor before printing, in order to avoid disqualification of the

---

(51) Ibid., p.400.

(52) Kling, op.cit., p.47.



whole issue after publication. The censor had disqualified an article by Z.P. Hayyoth because of some hints against Jesus, and the title of an article by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was changed from "*Selem ba-hekhal*" into "*Al sheté ha-Se<sup>c</sup>ipim*"<sup>(53)</sup> (volume 23, p.97). The monthly was accused of being insufficiently patriotic to the government. It was ordered to cease publication at the end of March 1915 because of hints against the Russian government in the story "*Ha-qaddish*" by D.A. Friedman<sup>(54)</sup> (in volume 32, p.228). Only three months later all Hebrew periodicals in Russia were banned.

The publication of Ha-Shiloah was resumed in April 1917 but was suspended again in April 1919 this time by the Soviet government and the Jewish socialist parties. This was after the publication of only two issues of volume 36. By the autumn of 1919 it became possible for Ha-Shiloah to resume publication but for financial reasons it did not. This was due to the large increase in the price of paper and the cost of printing. Moreover Klausner had already made up his mind to emigrate to Palestine. The publication of Ha-Shiloah was resumed in Jerusalem in March 1920 with a "completion" issue for volume 36.

Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Klausner could be considered as a new start and not as a continuation

---

(53) Shohetman, B.: Sefer Klausner, p.526.

(54) Klausner: Darki, p.143.

of the previous period, although it remained faithful to its past in its attitude towards the national movement.

"Throughout the years Ha-Shiloah fought against pure political Zionism on the one hand and against Judaism - negationists and Yiddish devotees on the other. It struggled always against what seemed to be extremist and misleading in life and in literature, but on the other hand it struggled to help what seemed to be certain and effective." (55)

The relative success of Ha-Shiloah during the editorship of Klausner was partly due to the extensive attention paid to it by H. Katzenelson who was its administrator from 1907 until its last day. Under his management Ha-Shiloah was always published on time, at the beginning of every month. Klausner edited the whole of Ha-Shiloah during 1903 for the monthly salary of 75 roubles, and when Bialik became co-editor Klausner's salary was 50 roubles for editing two thirds of the issue, plus 75 roubles for editing "*Osar ha-yahadut*." From 1907 to 1909 his salary was 100 roubles for his editorial work and from 1910 to 1919 it was 125 roubles.

From the beginning of 1903 Ha-Shiloah was not the only Hebrew monthly because Ha-Zeman had a monthly supplement. Although its poor quality did not qualify it to be a rival to Ha-Shiloah, it affected its success by attracting some of its subscribers and its contributors. However, the new generation of Hebrew readers brought up on the moral values of Ha-Shiloah came willingly to support it. Berkowitz who was one of that

---

(55) Baker & Toren, op.cit., p.214.

generation wrote in a letter to Bialik:

"You cannot imagine how much the elite of the new Hebrew readers liked Ha-Shiloah. Ha-Zeman with its ten quires and the plenty of trash in them is not qualified to take the place of Ha-Shiloah. I know and feel in my heart that the day in which one of my stories is published in Ha-Shiloah is considered a red letter day in my life."(56)

It was Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am who built up this reputation by creating a new standard in the Hebrew periodical literature. Klausner recognized this fact in a letter to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am when he declared:

"Those writers who want their words to be of permanent value are ready now more than ever to support Ha-Shiloah. I believe that this is due to you and not to me. You, my great friend, have made of Ha-Shiloah an organ whose contributors are proud of publishing their work in it; and I benefit from this reputation and I am very grateful to you."(57)

This feeling characterized the attitude of Klausner towards the monthly till its last issue. He wrote in a letter to Bialik:

"There is hardly an article or a story in Ha-Shiloah which has not been translated into German, English, Italian or Russian. If I were accepting in Ha-Shiloah material of inferior quality such a phenomenon would have been impossible. If the decision were mine I would maintain its publication as long as I am alive even if this would mean the loss of two thousand roubles each year."(58)

- 
- (56) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.82.  
 (57) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868I/1903.  
 (58) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.274.

As in previous periods, Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Klausner fought for its own concepts, but also found space for the important opposing concepts of others. Its reputation was respected all along even by those who criticized Ha-Shiloah. When one of the readers of Ha-MeCorer suggested to Brenner that he should suspend its publication following the reappearance of Ha-Shiloah in 1907, Brenner answered:

"Believe me, we are no less happy than you to see Ha-Shiloah resume publication. Nevertheless, we do not share your opinion that Ha-MeCorer must suspend publication in order not to divide the talents of Hebrew writers. Ha-MeCorer has never expected, even with its poor quality to take the place of a monthly like Ha-Shiloah. We hope to see Ha-Shiloah able to continue on its unique way in order to educate, judge and succeed gradually, and to become a good teacher for you, for us and for all Jews." (59)

Volumes 11-15 (1903-1905) were edited in Warsaw and printed in Cracow, in the Josef Fischer printing house. Volumes 16-36 (1907-1919) were edited, printed and published in Odessa. Of these volumes 16-21 were printed in the Bialik printing house, and volumes 22-36 were printed in the N. Halperin printing house - except the quadrated issue of volume 36 which was edited, printed and published in Jerusalem in the Levi printing house.

From the establishment of Ha-Shiloah till the end of the Russian period 216 issues were published, seven of them on special occasions:

---

(59) Kol Kitve Brenner, vol. iii, p.295.

1. Jubilee issue for Ahad Ha-Cam (vol. 30, No.3)  
March 1914.
2. Jubilee issue for Tchernichowsky (vol. 35, No.2)  
August 1918.
3. Commemoration issue for Lewinsky (vol.23, No.3)  
December 1910.
4. Commemoration issue for Mendele (vol. 34, No.1)  
January, 1918.
5. The 100th issue of Ha-Shiloah (vol. 17, No.4)  
October 1907.
6. The 150th issue of Ha-Shiloah (vol. 25, No.6)  
December 1911.
7. The 200th issue of Ha-Shiloah (vol. 34, No. 2)  
February 1918.

Multiplied issues:

1. Duplicated issues

Issues number 50-51 in volume 9

"	"	194-195	"	33
"	"	201-202	"	34
"	"	204-205	"	34
"	"	207-208	"	35

2. Tripled issue:

Issues number 88-89 in volume 15

(it was only 235 pages instead of 288).

3. Quadrated issue:

Issues number 213-216 in volume 36 (this issue included only instalments of unfinished works in the

first two issues of the volume, the poem "*Be-vet ha-gevarot*" by Tchernichowsky, and the last part of the first chapter as well as the second and third chapters of Klausner's book Historyah Yiśra'elit).

### 3. BIALIK AS CONTRIBUTOR AND ASSISTANT EDITOR

Hayyim Nahman Bialik 1873-1934 may be considered as the most important contributor to the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah. Throughout the 36 volumes published in Europe Bialik contributed 41 poems, some of them short, others long, 4 stories and 7 critical articles.

Bialik was greatly influenced by the language and style of Mendele, and equally influenced by the logic and philosophy of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. Indeed it was the latter who introduced Bialik to Hebrew literature. Rabbi Abelson who knew M.L. Lilienblum introduced Bialik to him. Lilienblum read his collection of poems, chose the poem "*El ha-Sippor*" and sent it with a letter of recommendation to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am; that was how Bialik became acquainted with the most important two publicists of the time. The poem pleased Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am who sent it to Rawnitzki the editor and publisher of Ha-Perdes, and it was published in the first volume in 1892. (1)

Bialik was a great admirer of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am all his life. In an autobiographical letter to Klausner he wrote: "I considered the day in which I read a new article by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as a feast for me. His words were, as it were, directed to the bottom of my heart and to the depth of my mind." (2) Bialik's love and respect for Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am

---

(1) Lachover, F.: Bialik, Hayyaw u-fo<sup>c</sup>alo, vol. i, p.107.

(2) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.168.

were expressed in a poem published in Ha-Shiloah after the resignation of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am as its editor. This poem caused the delay of the whole issue for a week because Klausner wanted it to appear in the first issue of the new Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(3)</sup> In this poem entitled "Le-Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am", Bialik wrote:

Since first thy light brcke on us, we behold  
Master! in thee the paladin of truth  
And champion of the spirit; clear of vision,  
Modest and pure in every thought and deed;  
Secure in thine own truth, not caring aught  
How others judge; treading thy chosen path  
With firm step and unflinching gaze, as one  
Who carries in his soul the sacred flame.  
And guards the last soul spark of heavenly fire.  
So shines some focal star that wheels his course  
On high, and draws his satelllites around him,  
Masters them from afar, and forces them  
Into his orbit by some hidden power.<sup>(4)</sup>

On other occasions Bialik said of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am:  
"It is possible to arrange a new way of life for the nationalist Jew, a quasi-prayer book, from Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's writings. His books could be regarded as a collection of rules for the nationalist movement."<sup>(5)</sup> "Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am gave us the interpretations of the scriptures in a good European style."<sup>(6)</sup> "Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was a man of rules which could be carried into practice. His style is influential especially because of its practicability and its sense of reality."<sup>(7)</sup> "As Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's student I give priority to action over thought and combine literary work with practical work."<sup>(8)</sup> In a letter which was read on

---

(3) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.264.

(4) Simon, L.(tr.): Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Essays, Letters, Memoirs, p.55

(5) Bialik: Devarim she-be<sup>c</sup>al Peh, vol. ii, p.197.

(6) Ibid., p.201.

(7) Ibid., p.195.

(8) Ibid., vol. i, p.127.



his behalf at the tenth literary anniversary of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am Bialik wrote:

"He was the first who tried to co-ordinate our literature with our real needs and to mingle them, but not to force a synthetic process with life... Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was the first to rouse the public to respect our Hebrew literature... Until Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am literature was not respected even by those who contributed to it; Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am urged us to respect it because he himself honoured it with his respect... We are deeply attached to him and we follow him with pleasure, sincerity and confidence."(9)

Bialik described the influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am on the younger generation in general and on himself in particular when he declared:

"Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was the most decisive event in my life. His first essay reached me when I was a student in the Volozhin Yeshiva. His essays influenced me and my fellow-students, not only by their new style, their glittering patterns and their decisive logical powers, but by the personality concealed in them, with a totally different stature to ours; it was then that we realized that he is leading us through a new way. Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am raised the respect of literature in the eyes of the writer himself. With Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am we felt it a great honour to be Hebrew writers and to take literature as our profession. When we saw the morality in his attitude towards literature - we began to respect ourselves more because we began to respect literature."(10)

Bialik described Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's literary achievement:

"Before Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, Jewish scientific literature was theological and didactic only; Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am came to guide the people and to introduce new rules which were extracted from what took shape in his mind."(11)

- 
- (9) 'Iggerot B., vol. i, pp.120-121.
  - (10) Bialik: Devarim, vol. ii, pp.191-194.
  - (11) Ibid., p.200.

Some critics considered that Bialik was too greatly under the influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. Y.L. Peretz wrote to Bialik: "You, my friend, are a prisoner, not in a spider's web (a hint to the expression used by Bialik in "*Ha-Matzmid*"), but in Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's hands." (12) This influence shows itself in Bialik's attitude towards the young writers who protested against the literary policy of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am.

"What a strange logic," he wrote, "is adopted by many of those who call for the widening of the scope of our literature when they believe that translating poems of alien writers will rescue the Jews from all their sufferings and their troubles... There is one and only one among us who proceeds with confidence, quietly and without the sound of a note of triumph, like a real disciple of our father Abraham, who does much and promises little; he is the one whose divine presence is always accompanied by honesty and modesty and deeds corresponding to thoughts - he is Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am." (13)

Some critics have believed that Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's influence on Bialik was only a passing phase in the life of Bialik:

"Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was his saviour and guide, and in order to understand the relationship between them both, one has to bear in mind that all his life Bialik did not have any methodical general knowledge. This was the reason for the discrepancy between his talented genius as a poet and his total submission to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am, the representative of the average intelligentsia in the purely intellectual field." (14)

Kurzweil, who employed the psychological approach in his work, stressed in another place that

---

(12) Meizel, *op.cit.*, p.376.

(13) *Iggerot Bialik*, vol. i, p.98.

(14) Kurzweil, B., *Sifrutenu ha-hadashah-hemshekh o-mahpekha*, p.222.

"Bialik's attitude towards Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am also helped in the traditional formation of Bialik's poetry... His poems aimed at Jewish understanding in a manner totally different from that of his teacher and master. The spiritual and philosophical significance bursting forth unintentionally from the poems of Bialik is superior in its profundity, its scope, and its intuitive to all that Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am dared to imagine. With its very fruitful concepts the poetry of Bialik overflows all that the conceptual and spiritual horizon of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am could have tolerated."(15)

On the other hand, there were others who believed that the influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am on Bialik was restraining and that Bialik did not remain faithful to his inner motives:

"We have read what the poet himself and his critics have said about the great benefit of this influence and its consequences. But a review of Bialik's poetry and its development, and a study of his concepts and their development, is enough to show that all this happened in spite of that influence which was of a cooling if not of a dwarfing nature. Therefore we can only consider their meeting as fatal."(16)

Others believed that Bialik accepted Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's attitude towards belles lettres in general and poetry in particular, knowing that this acceptance would have been a death-sentence for his poetry. This was a decisive turning point for Bialik's poetry and led to that terrible inner conflict in the poet.(17)

This attitude had made Bialik doubt his literary ability and the value of his poetry. When Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am

---

(15) Kurzweil: Bialik we-Tchernichowsky, p.100.

(16) Sadan, Dov: Ben din le-heshbon, p.9.

(17) Semah, A.: Ha-levi ha-mistatter, p.14.

invited him to write for Ha-Shiloah his answer was:

"It is enough for me to enjoy quietly the works of experienced writers like you; who am I to thrust myself into your temple? I do not have the necessary facility and talent which would make me dare to participate in your periodical." (18)

After sending his first poems to Ha-Shiloah Bialik wrote to Rawnitzki on the same subject: "I myself know that the days of my work in Ha-Shiloah are not very long because of my lack of facility and talent. In the end I will be thrown out of the literary field." (19) When he was looking for a publisher to publish his first collection of poems *Ahiasaf* undertook to do so provided that *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* agreed after reading them. Bialik expressed his doubts as to the outcome.

It was not long, however, before Bialik gained self-confidence in his poetic talent. In some cases he did not submit to *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am*'s editorial corrections of his poems. Furthermore, he did not react angrily when *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* disqualified some of his poems and he preferred to publish them as they were in other periodicals rather than to allow *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* to change them. Some of these poems are: "*Be-yom Staw*", "*Rabbi Zarah*", "*Yeshené <sup>C</sup>Afar*", "*Yaldut*", "*<sup>C</sup>Al levavkhem she-shamem*" and "*Tiqwat <sup>C</sup>ani*".

Although *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* was, at that time engaged in a conflict with both the young writers and political

---

(18) *Iggerot Bialik*, vol. i, p.84.

(19) *Ibid.*, p.89.

(20) *Iggerot A.H.*, vol. ii, p.128.

Zionism, he did not permit the publication of two poems written by Bialik against these movements. He gave us his reasons: "Despite my opposition to the methods of the Zionist leadership, I find it impossible to treat irreverently a movement which is holy for thousands of Jews."<sup>(20)</sup> In another letter to Bialik Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am wrote: "The poem "Mi-hazon Yesha<sup>c</sup>yahu" will be published perhaps with some changes because you have exaggerated a little."<sup>(21)</sup> Of another poem Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am said: "I am sorry that the poem which you have sent is not acceptable because I did not find in it what I have become used to seeking in your poems: original ideas and real poetry."<sup>(22)</sup> When Bialik sent his first story "Aryeh ba<sup>c</sup>al guf" for publication in Ha-Shiloah Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am wrote to him after reading it:

"In it there is a good kernel which proves that you have the ability to delineate beautifully. I was surprised to see the richness of your prosaic style. But it is impossible to publish the story in its present form; as you know, much of it should be omitted and the remaining parts will be like a group of fragments with no inner connection between them. Therefore I have decided to go through it again and to mark for you what I want you to omit so that you can replace what has been left out and to mend the breaches."<sup>(23)</sup>

This time Bialik submitted to Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am's demands because he found them justifiable.

The relationship between Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am and Bialik, based on respect and admiration, was also very formal.

---

(21) Ibid., vol. i, p.231..

(22) Ibid., vol. ii, p.262.

(23) Ibid., p.127.

His letters were addressed to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am in the formal manner customary among strangers, not in the warm and friendly tone of Bialik's letters to most of his friends.

"Although I was close to Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am for some time, I did not allow myself - out of respect and homage - to come any closer to him and to know more about his life, his family life and his intimate life; I knew only what was known to the public. I did not know if the reason for that distance was my admiration for him or because of the glory which created a distance between him and those who were in touch with him. The fact is that this distance was maintained until he left Odessa... I did not know if he himself was meticulous about this or not, but it is a fact that for some years I respected that distance." (24)

This attitude changed when Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am stayed in London and was depressed and broken. His morale as well as the loneliness brought the distance between them to an end. Bialik described this change in a very touching way when he said: "London has changed my Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am." (25)

The good relationship between Bialik and Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am continued until Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's last day. After his death Bialik assessed Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's influence on his generation when he wrote:

"Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's elevated stature as writer and guide to his generation stands out, particularly against the background of the period, of chaos, destruction and construction in confusion... Strong-spirited and clear-minded, he fused and epitomised the thoughts of generations and directed them towards the central spirit of Judaism. With the force of pure logic and withdrawn moral strictness, he educated a generation of 'impetuous people' in the discipline of orderly thought, taught them to

---

(24) Bialik: Devarim, vol. ii, pp.205-209.

(25) Ibid., p.191.

steer clear of exaggeration, to avoid seeing mountains as shadows of mountains, and all the other vain things in which the generation was steeped, Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am led Hebrew literature out of the narrow confines of provincial intimacy and constriction in the vastness of world thought. Noble of spirit and uncorrupted, he imprinted his pure stamp on the whole of Hebrew literature and thought, for his field of influence spread far beyond Ha-Shiloah and he himself became the spiritual hub of the generation. The reverence I felt for him the day I read his works never diminished from when I came into close association with him until his last day. I have always pictured him in my mind as a knight of the spirit, firm in his beliefs and his faith."(26)

At the beginning of 1904 Bialik was invited by Aḥiasaf, on the recommendation of Klausner, to edit the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah. They wanted to give Klausner more time in order to undertake new duties as chief editor of "*Oṣar ha-yahadut*." But Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not welcome the idea of Klausner becoming editor of both projects, for fear that this might damage the prospects of success for Ha-Shiloah as well as "*Oṣar ha-yahadut*".(27) He was also apprehensive that the atmosphere of Warsaw might spoil the talent of Bialik. He expressed his fears in a letter to Klausner in which he remarked: "Do not forget that there is only one Bialik in our literature."(28) Nevertheless, Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was, no doubt, glad to see Ha-Shiloah edited by two of his disciples, and therefore remaining faithful to some, at least, of his principles.

---

(26) <sup>c</sup>Ovadyahu, M.: Bialik speaks; N.Y.1969, pp.99-100.

(27) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.286.

(28) Ibid., p.298.

Before accepting the post Bialik laid down the condition that he should be totally independent in running his own section and in dealing with his own contributors, both financially and administratively. The section of belles lettres was one third of each issue - two quires. Bialik had to move to Warsaw from the beginning of 1904, and he had accepted this post of assistant editor at a salary of 75 roubles a month because he was not in a good financial position at that time. He started his editorial work immediately by sending letters to all the writers of belles lettres inviting them to collaborate with him. He tried even to persuade Shalom Alekhem to write in Hebrew or to translate some of his Yiddish manuscripts for Ha-Shiloah. Bialik wanted Ha-Shiloah to be a

"platform for writers of real talent who have something to say and know how to say it, a platform for writers of pure good taste who are clear-minded, without any discrimination between old and young, famous and beginner."(29)

In a letter to Shalom Alekhem, Bialik defined the material which he was prepared to accept. "The characterization of our real life and not the imaginary one, of the present life and not the past or even the future one."(30) This was his programme and he tried hard to carry it out, but with little success.

When Bialik commenced as assistant editor Klausner transferred to him all the material he had for the section

---

(29) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.200.

(30) Ibid., vol. ii, p.8.



of belles lettres. This material, however, did not satisfy Bialik. He described it as

"insufficient even to feed a dog... After going through most of the manuscripts which I have received, I came to the conclusion that we do not have writers of Hebrew, but rather fools, ignoramuses, vulgar and arrogant people." (31)

He was always complaining of the low standard of the belles lettres that he received. From the beginning of his editorial career he followed the same policy as Ahad Ha-Cam, correcting or even rejecting the material if it did not meet his own requirements. On one occasion he rejected a story by Berdyczewski although it met with his appreciation. He wrote: "Ha-Shiloah has a past which I cannot ignore all of a sudden, and as an editor I have certain obligations towards the readers and the publishers of Ha-Shiloah." (32)

He observed the rule, however, of informing every author of his reasons for rejecting the material either in a formal letter or in the form of "editorial reply" on the wrapper of the issue. He was not fully satisfied with the standard of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah. "It does not," he declared, "form a unified entity because it has no interest in present day life. It is partly literature for its own sake, partly memoirs or description of petty private feelings." (33)

---

(31) Ibid., vol. i, p.193.

(32) Ibid., p.211.

(33) Ibid., p.280.

Bialik was very much respected by all his contemporaries. When he became editor most of the contributors with whom he had to deal gratefully accepted the corrections he would make in their works; in some cases it was the contributors themselves who asked Bialik to correct what might need correction. When Tchernichowsky sent the idyll "Berlah holah" for Ha-Shiloah (vol. 18, p.92) he asked Bialik: "There are gaps which need filling. Please do that because I have no dictionary."<sup>(34)</sup> A similar request was made by E. Maidanek when he sent the sketch "Hulshah" (vol. 13, p.526) to Bialik. He said: "I want to ask you to do me a real favour by correcting what is imperfect in my work."<sup>(35)</sup>

There were stories published in Ha-Shiloah of which complete chapters were written by Bialik. Nevertheless even those writers who used to complain of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's severity in correcting their works were not very strict with Bialik, although Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am would only omit and correct while Bialik used to add a great deal. Sometimes there was no harmony between the medium quality of the original work and the high standard of the editorial corrections. On one occasion this lack of balance in standards led to severe criticism of M. Secco (Meyer Smilanski) following the publication of his story "Qedoshim" (vol. 13, p.344). J. Rabinowitz described him of being "either so clever that he could imitate the

---

(34) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.297.

(35) Ibid.

style of prominent writers or of being uncultivated so that his style acquired different forms according to the corrections of his editors." (36) This criticism upset not only Bialik who blamed Frischmann for allowing the criticism to be published in his periodical. It also upset Secco himself who sent a desperate letter to Bialik in which he wrote:

"Suddenly the Odessans have become very angry with me. They decided unanimously that it is my duty to publish an announcement declaring that the story "Qedoshim" was written by Bialik and that I only wrote for him the unprocessed material. They threatened that if I did not do this myself others would announce it in public. In my opinion you should write an immediate letter to calm the Odessans and to assure them that you will never publish my work in Ha-Shiloah again. I shall do my best to develop my literary techniques and to improve my knowledge of Hebrew language and literature. I sincerely hope that one day my standard will be satisfactory, and that I shall prove to you that you were not mistaken in your judgement. I also hope that within a few years others will admit the truth of this judgement." (37)

On the other hand, Secco was annoyed because Bialik corrected much in his story without even informing him. He wrote to Bialik:

"When I read the sketch "Qedoshim" in Ha-Shiloah I grumbled much against you, my beloved teacher. You have decorated and adorned my sketch with your rich paintbrush but you were wrong in doing that. This is cheating... You should have informed me so that I could have, at least, signed another pseudonym." (38)

---

(36) Rabinowitz, J.: "Baté haroshet shel sefrut", Ha-Dor,

(37) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.192.

(38) Ibid.

Bialik's treatment did not please all his contributors. The young writer G. Shuffman was not happy when he saw how many changes Bialik made in his story "*Qetanot*" (vol. 14, p.46). He wrote to Bialik:

"Believe me, sir, if I tell you that I do not remember having been so deeply pained as when I saw the changes in my story, especially the long addition at the end. Is this the little which you said you would change? If you were unable to publish it as it was, you should have informed me in advance. To put into my mouth words which are not mine without asking me - this is cruel contempt from you which I shall not forget." (39)

He even demanded that Bialik should write an editorial remark in Ha-Shiloah telling its readers how much he had added to this story; but Bialik convinced him that this would harm the contributor and not the editor.

Bialik's relations with his contributors were very friendly. He was glad to help and encourage young writers and beginners. One of them was Brenner whose financial position was not at all good when he deserted from the Russian army. It was due to Bialik's recommendation that *Ahiasaf* accepted Brenner as a permanent writer for Ha-Shiloah and agreed to pay him 20 roubles a month on account. Bialik also acted as teacher to Brenner by instructing him and correcting his works. After reading the story "*Me-saviv la-nequdah*" (vol. 14) Bialik commented: "I realize that haste is spoiling your work very much. I found many defects which could have been amended. Lengthiness, verbiage, disorder of events,

---

(39) *Ibid.*, p.298.

unnecessary words, rashness and haste in details and style."<sup>(40)</sup> In another letter he said: "The language of your story requires correction, please try to improve your language... You have a style of your own which is being spoilt by your slackness."<sup>(41)</sup>

Another writer was I. Katzenelson to whom he wrote:

"I have read your drama *"Ha-hammah! ha-hammah!"* (vol. 17, p.366). It is light but beautiful and my heart did not allow me to reject it. So I shall publish it in *Ha-Shiloah* although it is not to my taste. You have a certain literary beauty which is dreamy and unreal."<sup>(42)</sup>

Bialik complained constantly of the lack of suitable material. Many stories and poems were sent to him but most of them were just chatter which lacked real substance. Klausner suggested a reduction in the number of pages allocated to belles lettres and an expansion of the other sections because he was receiving more than he needed for these sections. Bialik did not accept this view.<sup>(43)</sup>

Because of the lack of suitable material, Bialik had no choice but to fill his section with his own work. He translated for volume 17 two Yiddish stories written by B. Shapira ("*Avram'l ha-sandelar*" and "*Yonim*"). In the poetry section he managed to obtain the collaboration of most of his contemporaries like

(40) *'Iggerot Bialik*, vol. i, pp.267-270.

(41) *Ibid.*, p.270.

(42) *Ungerfeld*, *op.cit.*, p.280.

(43) *'Iggerot Bialik*, vol. i, p.280.

Tochernichowsky, J. Cohen, Z. Shneour, J. Fishman, I. Katzenelson, J. Steinberg, D. Shimoni and others. Bialik's policy, however did not satisfy Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am. He wrote in a letter to Klausner: "With a broken heart I realize that our Bialik broken my fences and opened the doors of Ha-Shiloah to works of passion and obscenity. But what can I do? Each generation has its own editors and its own concepts." (44)

When it was decided not to publish "*Osar ha-yahadut*" Bialik continued to edit the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah but his salary was reduced to 50 roubles a month. This did not continue long because the publication of Ha-Shiloah was suspended in April 1905. When he was asked to return as assistant editor in 1907 he insisted on publishing the monthly in Odessa so that it would be printed in his printing house established a short time previously. His salary remained 50 roubles a month. From 1907 editorial work became extremely difficult for Bialik either because most of his contributors had left Russia during the disturbances of 1905, or because of the severe corrections and additions inserted in the works of his contributors.

The constant misunderstanding between Klausner and Bialik developed into complete lack of communication for some time. The reason, according to Klausner, lay in the difference in their social and educational background. This affected both their relationship and their editorial

---

(44) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iv, p.124.

work. Klausner commented:

"There were conflicts and disagreements between us. Most of the material in my sections did not find favour in Bialik's eyes, while on the other hand I did not agree with his admiration of works favouring ghetto life. According to the agreement between us, however, we were not allowed to interfere in each other's work... Disputes started between us, mainly on matters of principle and not on personal or private matters. We used to discuss these matters with enthusiasm, and sometimes our discussions ended in a dispute which was flamed by outsiders." (45)

Bialik and Klausner used to exchange compliments or even criticisms on material published in Ha-Shiloah.

Klausner allowed himself to express his appreciation of Bialik's section in the second issue of volume 15.

He wrote about the stories "*Ba-yamim ha-hem*" of Steinberg and "*Rishmé derekh*" of Brenner:

"They are good now as a result of your corrections which are pleasant and acceptable - but because these are so many Brenner's own character has become indistinct... Katzenelson's poem "*Ba-laylah*" is good but light, according to his usual manner. Your poem "*Qumi Şe'i*" too - forgive me for saying this - is good but light and you should have sent it to Ha-Dor. Frischmann would have been very happy to have it because his main object is only external beauty." (46)

On the other hand, Bialik did not like the way in which Klausner criticized two of Bernfeld's articles in his review of the periodical Ha-COmer, (47) and the subsequent argument between Bernfeld and 'Ish 'Ivri

(45) Klausner, Darki, p.131.

(46) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.274.

(47) 'Ish 'Ivri: "*Mi-sifrut 'Eres Yisra'el*", Ha-Shiloah xx, 580.

(a pseudonym for Klausner). In a strong letter to Klausner Bialik wrote:

"Since the foundation of Ha-Shiloah nothing has been published in it like your remarks. To my sorrow there is nothing in the volumes of Ha-Shiloah that resembles their vengeance, vindictiveness and impoliteness... A popular literary article appreciated by the reading public should not be criticized in the way you have done. If there is a personal dispute between the author and the critic, even if the latter is sincere, he should not criticize his opponent in a way which aims only at creating prejudice... I am not speaking about the indecent arrogance of your remarks written in the tone of a teacher and master against a man who is older and more knowledgeable than he is, or even about the personal hatred which penetrates each line. I am speaking about the morality of the whole matter, at least from its formal side."(48)

Hayyim Katzenelson was the mediator between Bialik and Klausner. He was grieved to see the publication of the monthly affected by the unstable relationship between two editors who were on bad terms with each other. He used to put pressure on Bialik in order to speed up his work. This pressure, combined with the heavy burden of correspondence with his contributors, seems to have caused Bialik's resignation. This was announced unexpectedly in volume 21 (p.552) in a short note to his readers and contributors. He wrote: "To my great regret I must withdraw from the editorship of Ha-Shiloah for certain reasons. I shall have no responsibility for it from the beginning of 1910."

---

(48) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.276.



This announcement was followed by a comment by Klausner.

He wrote:

"The editorship of Ha-Shiloah regrets to announce that Bialik cannot take part in editing the monthly any more. In the meantime I want to express my great gratitude to him for his role in editing Ha-Shiloah from 1905 till now. I also hope that our great poet will increase his contribution to Ha-Shiloah with his poems and stories."

The formal resignation of Bialik was handed to Katzenelson in December 1909.

#### 4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

When *Ahiasaf* decided to appoint Klausner as the new editor of Ha-Shiloah this was on the understanding that the editorship would be in Warsaw, that the paper would be printed in Cracow, that the monthly salary of the editor would be 75 roubles and that the paper would have at least 850 subscribers a year so that the losses of *Ahiasaf* would not exceed 2000 roubles a year. They retained the right to suspend its publication indefinitely after completing volume 11 if it did not attract the required number of subscribers. For his part Klausner laid down the condition that the management committee should not interfere in his editorial work.<sup>(1)</sup> Kaplan was responsible for conducting any negotiations with the censorship, either with Nehemiah Zachs in Warsaw or with Israel Landau, the chief censor in St. Petersburg, who used to accept bribes for allowing the publication of periodicals without hindrance. The honoraria for contributions remained as before: .01 rouble for each stanza of poetry and 1.5 roubles for each page of prose. Klausner also maintained the charity fund which *Ahad Ha-Cam* established for writers who wanted to contribute their honorarium for the benefit of poor writers.<sup>(2)</sup>

Following the radical changes announced in the new manifesto of Ha-Shiloah, the number of subscribers

---

(1) 'Arkhiyon K./129/25.11.1902

(2) Ibid., 128II/17.8.1910.

increased to 1,100 in addition to the 300 copies sent free to members of Ahiasaf, to contributors to Ha-Shiloah and to the editorial boards of other periodicals. (3)

The enthusiasm for the new Ha-Shiloah did not continue long. Readers and writers began to criticize Klausner for his failure to fulfil his promises and to implement his programme. This disappointment led to a reduction in the number of subscribers for the second half of 1903. In order to avoid a financial crisis, Ahiasaf was ready to consider a proposal put forward by Ben-Zion Katz. That would have meant the change of the name of the monthly to Ha-Zeman, and its publication as a monthly supplement to the daily newspaper, Ha-Zeman; its plates would be laid out at Warsaw and sent to St. Petersburg for printing, that it would be edited by Klausner and Katz would do his best within the first year to restore the name of the monthly Ha-Shiloah. Katz accepted the amendment that Ha-Shiloah should retain its name and its character. The subscription fees for the daily and the monthly were to be 10 roubles a year, with a possibility of enlarging Ha-Shiloah to eight quires instead of six without affecting its price. Klausner would edit four quires and Bialik would edit the other four. (4)

While Kaplan was in favour of the idea, the other members of Ahiasaf's management committee opposed it because they were thinking in another direction. Some of

---

(3) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868 II/1904.

(4) Ibid., 6.11.1903.

them (Stawski, Gluskin and Eliashov) contributed large sums of money to the funds of the daily Ha-Sofeh, and one of them, Eliashov, had been appointed executive of Ha-Sofeh. They were in favour of linking Ha-Shiloah with Ha-Sofeh. As for Katz, he published his own monthly which he called Ha-Zeman.

The first issue of Ha-Sofeh appeared on 21st December 1902. Its editor was E.E. Friedman and his deputy was A. Ludvipol. The idea of linkage between Ha-Shiloah and Ha-Sofeh was accepted. Accordingly Ha-Shiloah was offered to the subscribers of Ha-Sofeh at a reduced charge - two roubles a year instead of six, and those who were living in Warsaw were able to receive Ha-Shiloah directly from its editorial office for only 1.25 roubles a year. This arrangement increased the number of subscribers to Ha-Shiloah to 8,000.<sup>(5)</sup>

Ha-Sofeh was successful and popular from its first year. Its circulation reached 3,000 copies in the first year, and after the arrangement with Ha-Shiloah the number reached 10,000 copies.<sup>(6)</sup> It was more successful than the other two dailies, Ha-Melis and Ha-Sefirah because many readers had no alternative but to subscribe to Ha-Melis as a result of dissatisfaction with Ha-Sefirah and its opposition to Hibbat Zion. When Ha-Sofeh was published they did not hesitate to subscribe to it because Ludvipol was known as a Hovev Zion. The

(5) Klausner: "Yovel Shanim le-Citton Civri", Ha-Boqer: No. 5234, 2.1.1953.

(6) Ibid.

financial success of Ha-Sofeh did not continue long as a result of mismanagement. Friedman's salary was 250 roubles a month as editor and Ludvipol's was 150 roubles; Peretz, Brainin and Bernfeld were paid 100 roubles each as regular contributors. (7) As for contributors and correspondents from other cities, Ha-Sofeh was paying more than 10,000 roubles a year. The initial capital with which the publication of Ha-Sofeh started was 7,000 roubles. This money was wasted on a large flat and expensive furniture to such an extent that in the second year of its publication Eliashov did not have enough money to pay commission to Ahiasaf, the honoraria to contributors, or even charges to the printer. (8)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was not happy about this link. He wrote in a letter to Kaplan:

"I am sorry to see Ha-Shiloah attached to Ha-Sofeh because this means that the former has become as it were a supplement to a daily - but necessity knows no law. I am sure that this will not affect the character of Ha-Shiloah. The advantage of this link is that Ha-Shiloah will have to appear on time." (9)

This was exactly what happened. Under the pressure of time Ha-Shiloah had to accept material of low standard. Moreover, the printing errors - which in some cases spoiled the meaning - increased for two reasons. First, the printer in Cracow stopped sending the proofs to Warsaw for correction to avoid delay in publication, and

---

(7) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/8.1.1903.

(8) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.237

(9) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.285.

secondly the large number of copies made it difficult to carry out any proof reading. (10)

At the beginning of 1905 the editorial board of Ha-Sofeh announced that its readers could subscribe either to Ha-Sofeh with Ha-Shiloah or to Ha-Sofeh with "Osar leshon ha-migra' we-ha-mishnah" of S.J. Fuenn which was completed and published after his death by S.P. Rabinowitz in 1900-1903. This move reduced the number of subscribers to Ha-Shiloah to 4,000. In addition to that, Friedman managed to obtain a permit for a monthly by the name of Ha-Sofeh. He wanted to get rid of Ha-Shiloah and to give the new monthly as a supplement to the subscribers to his daily. The publication of the new monthly would have made it impossible for Ha-Shiloah to continue because it was already having difficulty because of the rivalry of Ha-Zeman. Klausner, however, succeeded in convincing Friedman to call off his plan for the new monthly in addition to his efforts in seeking financial help for Ha-Shiloah. (11)

This situation did not continue long. Ha-Sofeh was forced to suspend publication on 29th April 1905, and Ha-Shiloah was left between life and death in the middle of volume 15. Furthermore, the printer in Cracow decided to stop printing Ha-Shiloah from April onwards. The last three issues reached subscribers after a long delay because Eliashov did not have enough money to pay for

(10) 'Iggerot B., vol. i, p.217.

(11) 'Arkhivon A.H./868II/14.1.1905.

the postage. (12) When Ha-Sofeh suspended publication it had 8,000 subscribers, but there was no money to run the business. (13)

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not like to see Ha-Shiloah cease publication in the middle of a volume especially since he had advised Ahiasaf to suspend its publication from the beginning of 1905 in order to avoid this disgrace. (14) He expressed his opinion in a letter to Kaplan in which he wrote:

"If there is even a slim chance of publishing the remaining issues of this volume, then Ahiasaf must take it. But if it is not at all possible, then it would be better to cease publication now and to publish the remaining issues afterwards. The honour of both Ahiasaf and Ha-Shiloah requires that volumes of Ha-Shiloah should be completed and in their usual shape so that it will not be written in history that Ha-Shiloah faced a dreadful death in the middle of a volume." (15)

These issues (4-6) appeared in October 1905 in a trebled issue which was only 14 quires (instead of 18). Ahiasaf had to spend 1,000 roubles on the publication of this issue despite debts which were more than 20,000 roubles. (16) Klausner suggested to Ahiasaf that they should publish another two trebled issues in order to complete the year of Ha-Shiloah, but the idea was not accepted. (17)

- 
- (12) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.273.  
 (13) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/2.3.1905.  
 (14) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iii, p.340.  
 (15) Ibid., p.344.  
 (16) 'Arkhiyon K./129/30.7.1905.  
 (17) Ibid.,/197/3.9.1905

Ha-Sofeh played an important role in the development of Hebrew Literature despite the fact that it was only a daily newspaper and that its duration was only two years and four months. In its search for new talent, especially in the field of fiction, it established the first prize in modern Hebrew literature for the best short story. The first of these prizes was won by A.D. Berkowitz for his story "*Moshkele Hazir*". The importance of Ha-Sofeh exceeded the bounds of its unique achievements in the fields of belles lettres and criticism. In fact these achievements were made possible because of a principle which had become the central pillar of the daily newspaper. We may define it by the disputed term which would have seemed impracticable before that time: "Judeo-Europeanism". This principle brought into effect new criteria regarding quality, themes, and ideas in its publicistic and literary sections, and made possible an extraordinary response to the new literary growth at the turn of the century and to new spiritual and aesthetic demands not fully expressed in other periodicals. Ha-Sofeh became the herald of the future, and influenced the development of the Hebrew press. Moreover, it is also considered as closing a period, because by it the climax of continuous evolution was produced in the success of a "European" trend through an important synthesis with the Jewish element. (18)

---

(18) Golan, A.: "Ha-mediniyut ha-sifrutit la-Citton ha-yomi Ha-Sofeh" Moznayim, Xlvi, 42.



There were other reasons for the financial failure of Ha-Sofeh besides mismanagement. It had adopted the same national policy as Ha-Shiloah. They both fought hard against the idea of a Jewish state in Uganda. This policy drove many readers away from them both and therefore reduced the number of their subscribers. On the other hand, it was Friedman's opinion that it was through the link with Ha-Shiloah imposed on him by Ahiasaf that Ha-Sofeh lost its popularity. He maintained:

"Apart from the boycott which was declared against Ha-Sofeh by the Ugandists, Ha-Shiloah could be considered as a strong reason for the financial failure of Ha-Sofeh. This excellent monthly, unique in our periodical literature in its spiritual standard and its literary resources, was respected and appreciated by exceptional individuals from both its friends and its opponents, but it was not acceptable to readers of middle grade who were the essential public of a daily... At the beginning of 1904, three of the Ahiasaf management committee who were also members of the board for publishing Ha-Sofeh displayed their wisdom by imposing Ha-Shiloah on Ha-Sofeh. The number of subscribers to Ha-Shiloah through Ha-Sofeh increased to more than 5,000, but from the second quarter onwards this number began to decrease to 4,000, 3,000 and reached 2,500. The number of subscribers to Ha-Sofeh decreased accordingly."(19)

Nevertheless Ha-Sofeh could have survived had it not been for the Bundists who closed its printing house during the first Russian revolution at the beginning of May 1905. (20)

Ha-Shiloah suspended publication from July 1905 till January 1907 when it resumed publication again.

---

(19) Friedman, E.E.: Sefer ha-Zikhronot, p.303.

(20) Klausner: Ha-Boger... 2.1.1953.

During this period several attempts were made to revive Ha-Shiloah. The first was during the Zionist Congress in 1905 when Naiditach, Shai Ish Horowitz, Halperin, Lewinsky and Nofekh collected the sum of 700 roubles for it. A.E. Leobaraski also promised substantial help from Wissotzky's company provided that they would be assured that Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was in favour of resuming its publication.<sup>(21)</sup> L.A. Menz promised Klausner to contribute 200 roubles to help in resuming its publication<sup>(22)</sup> while Tschlenow and Zlotopolski said that they will do their best for it. Horowitz suggested that the money should be deposited with him to pay the salaries of editors and contributors in order to make sure that Ahiasaf would not use it to repay its debts. This idea was rejected by Ahiasaf who considered it an insult and lack of confidence in them.<sup>(23)</sup> Some months later Horowitz suggested the amalgamation of Ahiasaf and the Sinai publishing house which was owned by him. This would have formed a new company on a strong financial base which would enable it to resume the publication of Ha-Shiloah. When his efforts did not succeed he published his own monthly in Berlin which he called He-<sup>c</sup>Atid.

About the beginning of 1906 when the political situation became more stable and the possibility of

---

(21) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/8.8.1905.

(22) Ibid.,/29.8.1905.

(23) 'Arkhiyon A.H./868II/8.8.1905.

Ibid.,/29.8.1905.

'Arkhiyon K./129/10.8.1905.

resuming the publication of Ha-Shiloah was brighter, it was suggested that the monthly should be handed over to the Zionist Organization; that would solve its financial problems and guarantee its success. In order to preserve its character Bialik and Klausner were invited to edit as before. In a letter to Bialik dated 12th March 1906 and signed by Y.L. Goldberg on behalf of the Zionist Centre in Vilna it was stated that the monthly would be published in Palestine if possible and would be called Ha-Hermon, and if not it would appear in Vilna and its name would remain Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(24)</sup> Their plan was to obtain a permit for the monthly Ha-Hermon to be published in Vilna with Zlatopolski as its editor and publisher, and eventually Klausner could become its editor jointly with Bialik. Klausner had some reservations over the choice of Vilna as a centre for their work and over the name Ha-Hermon. Instead he suggested one of the names: Yisra'el, Ha-'umah or Hithaddeshut.<sup>(25)</sup>

Ahiasaf, however, did not welcome the idea.

In a letter to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Klausner wrote:

"I have received a long letter from Kaplan in which he informed me that they have not given up hope in Ha-Shiloah because there are two men who are ready to support its publication with 2,000 roubles a year. But even if they did not fulfil their promise he has another hope: he thinks that the time is not suitable for publishing "Osar ha-yahadut" now, and that he still has several thousands of roubles of its fund... If the members of Ahiasaf agree to use this fund, then the publication of Ha-Shiloah would be guaranteed for some years and it would therefore remain as it was, a Zionist organ, oppositionist and not factional."<sup>(26)</sup>

(24) 'Iggerot B., vol. ii, p.14.

(25) 'Arkhiyon A.H./808II/20.4.1906.

(26) Ibid., 21.3.1906.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am too was against this idea. He explained to the people who proposed it that he would not agree to let Ha-Shiloah become an organ of the Zionist Organization. It had been independent and that is how it should remain, otherwise it will be better not to resume its publication again.<sup>(27)</sup> He convinced the people of the Zionist Centre that it would be impossible to obtain a permit to publish a new monthly in Palestine. So they decided to publish their monthly in Warsaw with the form and character of Ha-Shiloah and possibly under the previous editorship; only they thought of changing the name in the hope that this might lead to a change in its luck.<sup>(28)</sup> They allocated 4,000 roubles a year to support its publication,<sup>(29)</sup> but once again Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not agree.

Another attempt to resume the publication of Ha-Shiloah was made by Bialik and Ussishkin who offered to pay 200 roubles a year to Ahiasaf and to keep its name on Ha-Shiloah as its publisher in return for allowing them to use the name and to publish it in Odessa.<sup>(30)</sup> In the meantime Ussishkin and Zlatopolski succeeded in obtaining a permit to publish in Odessa a new monthly which was to be called Ha-Yarden. After obtaining the

---

(27) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. iv, p.14.

(28) Ibid., p.15.

(29) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. ii, p.16.

(30) 'Arkhiyon K.7/129/1.8.1906.

approval of both Ahad Ha-CAm and Ahiasaf the name was changed to Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(31)</sup> They were assured that the monthly would be under the close care of Ussishkin who would move to Odessa, and who gave an assurance that he would guarantee continuance of the publication for at least a whole year. Ussishkin was chairman of the board of trustees, which prepared to republish Ha-Shiloah.<sup>(33)</sup>

Zlatopolski offered to cover the losses of Ha-Shiloah up to 1,500 roubles a year if the number of subscribers would not be enough to support it. An appeal "to the Hebrew reading public" was published in Hebrew periodicals of that time; it was signed by Ussishkin, Ahad Ha-CAm, Barbash, Y.L. Goldberg, B.D. Ginzberg, S. Dubnow, Lilienblum, Lewinsky, Kaplan, Tschlenow, Y.L. Katzenelson and Rawnitzki. In this appeal, which was written by Bialik, it was stated:

"We now need a literary periodical which can be used as a centre for the best of our writers and a house of learning for clarifying all the serious problems in our life from our nationalistic point of view... It is a great insult to us to see that our nationalistic literature must pray for mercy in order to collect 1,000 subscribers for its only monthly, but the insult will be greater if this prayer were rejected."<sup>(34)</sup>

Ussishkin made it clear that he guaranteed the return of the subscription fees in case of failure to collect the required number of subscribers.<sup>(35)</sup> Volunteer and

---

(31) Lachover, F.: Bialik Hayaw u-fo<sup>c</sup>alo, vol. iii, p.644.

(32) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.270.

(33) 'Iggerot B., vol. ii, p.39.

(34) Shohetman: "Ha-Shiloah, 50 shanah le-re'shit hofa<sup>c</sup>ato." Gilyonot, vol. xxi, 1947-8, p.104.

(35) Lachover, op.cit., iii, 644.

paid agents were appointed in various places to collect subscribers to Ha-Shiloah. In this way they managed to collect in a short time 3,000 subscribers, a sufficient number to guarantee its success without the support of Zlatopolski. (36)

There were problems concerning the permission of the Russian government. For this reason Kaplan wanted Ha-Shiloah to remain in Warsaw, while Bialik and Ussishkin wanted to have it published in Odessa. Bialik wrote in a letter to Klausner:

"If Kaplan does not agree to transfer the permit of Ha-Shiloah from Warsaw to Odessa we shall publish our monthly here (in Odessa) under the name Ha-Yarden and the field of Ahiasaf will be swept away for ever." (37)

Permission was granted to publish Ha-Shiloah in Odessa with Bialik as editor. The application was made in his name to avoid any problems with the authorities for they might not have accepted Klausner as editor; he had just returned from Switzerland, which was considered by the Russian government as suspect because all the Russian revolutionaries were concentrated there at that time. (38)

Klausner was offered a teaching job at a women's college in St. Petersburg, but Bialik and Ussishkin succeeded in persuading him to stay in Odessa; it would not have been possible for Ha-Shiloah to appear ~~at~~ St.

---

(36) 'Arkhiyon K./129/1906.

(37) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. ii, p.31.

(38) Klausner: Darki, p.131

Petersburg because it was far from being a centre for Hebrew literature. In a letter to Klausner Bialik wrote: "As long as there is doubt about your coming to Odessa the publication of Ha-Shiloah will remain uncertain." (39)

Klausner decided to stay in Odessa and to edit Ha-Shiloah as before. He wrote later:

"Ha-Shiloah was very dear to me and I was concerned about its existence. Besides I had great respect for Ahad Ha-Cam, Bialik, Mendele and Ussishkin. Furthermore all my family and the family of my wife were in Odessa." (40)

The first issue of volume 16 appeared in January 1907 with the same character and form as the previous period. Its subscription fees also remained as before, the only change was that Bialik's name appeared on volume 16 as sole editor and on volume 17 as chief editor, instead of that of Klausner for the reason mentioned above. (41) Bialik also became its printer after establishing a printing house in Odessa together with S. Buryshkin. All the administrative and editorial work was done in Odessa.

At the end of 1907 an attempt was made by the new publishers of Ha-Shiloah to publish a new weekly in Odessa which was to be called Ha-Tehiyyah. Each issue was to include two quires full of publicistics, current events, criticism and belles lettres. Its editorial board was

---

(39) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. ii, p.31.

(40) Klausner: Darki, p.130.

(41) Ibid., p.131.

formed of Lilienblum, Lewinsky, Rawnitzki, A. Borochoy and J. Rabinowitz. Its subscription fees were four roubles a year or two roubles for six months; with Ha-Shiloah the fees were eight roubles for a year or four for six months. An appeal was launched "to those who love the Hebrew language and literature." It was signed by Ussishkin who stated the condition that its publication would depend on the number of subscribers obtained. If this number would not be enough to support it he promised to return the subscription fees. Apparently they did not succeed in collecting enough subscribers because the weekly did not appear.

Another attempt to link Ha-Shiloah with a popular periodical was made a year later. The new periodical was to be called Ha-Hayyim and to appear as a daily in the form of Ha-Sofeh in its first year. Its subscription fees were to be seven roubles a year, and with Ha-Shiloah ten roubles a year. The publishers hoped to attract some of the readers of Ha-Zeman who were paying ten roubles a year for the daily alone.<sup>(42)</sup> This attempt too did not materialize and Ha-Shiloah continued to support itself through the efficient management of H.Y. Katzenelson who became its administrator from 1907 onwards.

---

(42) 'Arkhiyon K./197/5.11.1908.



## 5. A LITERARY SURVEY OF HA-SHILOAH DURING THE SECOND PERIOD

Klausner widened the scope of Hebrew literature in Ha-Shiloah uniting famous writers with beginners on its pages. He brought to light and encouraged many new writers who soon became outstanding figures in Hebrew literature. The most important element in his editorial policy was to open the doors of his monthly to any writer provided that his contribution was of good standard and written in a good literary style. He accepted translations and articles dealing with social sciences which previously would not have appeared in Ha-Shiloah. Under his editorship the order of sections was changed to give preference to belles lettres over scientific articles, and this is the order that we shall follow here.

### 1. Belles lettres:

Not only was the quantity of belles lettres increased to cover almost one third of each issue (that is 30-35 pages) but also the themes were expanded to cover general aspects of day-to-day life. The reason for the extensive and intensive activity in this branch of literature was primarily due to the Zionist movement; directly or indirectly it had modified the attitude of both writers and readers towards the aims and functions of Hebrew literature. On the other hand, the numerous changes which took place in Jewish life

during this period had created a large number of problems which required analysis and close discussion.

As stated before, many new talents made their debut in this section of Ha-Shiloah. The most outstanding among them were: J. Fishman, Z. Shneour and D. Shimoni as poets and A. Barash, S. Asch and Berkowitz as story writers. There were others like Tchernichowsky who increased their contributions to the monthly beyond what might have been expected from them compared with their contribution in the period of Ahad Ha-Cam. Others who were already famous appeared in Ha-Shiloah for the first time under Klausner's editorship like I.L. Peretz.

Klausner played a central role in introducing Tchernichowsky to his readers. They had been friends since early childhood and remained friends throughout their lives in spite of their difference in talent and temperament. Klausner guided Tchernichowsky in his reading, introduced him to Hebrew literary circles and fortified him in his resolve to become a Hebrew poet. It was Klausner who used to send the poems of Tchernichowsky to Hebrew editors after correcting his language and style. It was under Klausner's influence that the poet wrote in Hebrew and abandoned any ambition he might have had to write poetry in Russian.

"For years Tchernichowsky submitted his work to Klausner before publication. Klausner would correct his grammar, eliminate archaic expressions, suggest themes and help improve his style. He even provided titles for several of the poems. Moreover, it was Klausner who saw to it that the

first volume of Tchernichowsky's poems appeared, and he continued to play a significant role in the development of his friend's literary activity."(1)

Tchernichowsky's poetry was something radically new in Hebrew literature. He sang about nature, women, love, and different lands, peoples and eras. He played a stimulating part in Hebrew literature by introducing to it several alien cultures through his numerous and long translations from Greek, German, French, Russian, English and other languages. He was the first writer in Modern Hebrew literature to sing "To the Sun" and to address himself to Apollo and other ancient nature deities. But

"the Hebrew public and the critics were not quite ready for Tchernichowsky: his preoccupation with love, his peculiar prosody and his non-Biblical language were qualities that tended to alienate the poet from his readers... A serious reader and writer like Aḥad Ha-<sup>o</sup>Am would not accept a poem for the annual which he edited, Luah Ahiasaf for 1896, because the poet wrote:

I shall embrace you, love you and kiss you with passion and with fire."(2)

Tchernichowsky's contribution to Ha-Shiloah (volumes 11-36) covered a wide range of genres: poems, sonnets, ballads, idylls, stories and even a critical article, another on philology, and finally his autobiography. When Bialik became editor of the belles lettres section of Ha-Shiloah, the attitude of the journal towards Tchernichowsky did not change despite

---

(1) Kling, op.cit., p.124.

(2) Silberschlag, S.: Saul Tchernichowsky, 1968, pp.14-16.

the fact that Bialik was very much influenced by Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's views on the function of modern Hebrew literature. Twelve of Tchernichowsky's poems in Ha-Shiloah were edited by Bialik who allowed himself to change and correct some of them after receiving an approval from Tchernichowsky in advance. In the idyll "Ke-hom ha-yom" Bialik added a complete chapter in addition to the corrections he made. (3)

Another writer whom Ha-Shiloah made very popular was J.H.Brenner. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am might have befriended Brenner, cultivated his literary talent and rescued him from isolation and obscurity, yet he took little interest in him. There was a profound difference of opinion between the two on the essential character of Jewish culture, its relation to the Bible and traditional Judaism in general. Brenner's opinion was that Hebrew culture must free itself from its traditional attachment to religion and to the past. In this he was following in the footsteps of Berdyczewski. In one of his articles Brenner made it clear that he respected Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am while not accepting his philosophy:

"I am not one of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's followers. This name no longer enchants me as it did in my youth. I no longer think of him as an outstanding and prolific writer, that is to say, a writer who is capable not only of producing thoughts but also of teaching others how to think, a writer whose work should be continued... He has

---

(3) Ungerfeld, op.cit., p.133.

a virulent and sharp language which is made pleasant by the restrained embitterment of a distinguished and refined person, and he has a capability of focussing on a certain view point, his own view point, to the extent of annulling anything else... Nevertheless the existence of Ahad Ha-Cam is very important, but this existence should not be defective. Accordingly, I call for an extensive literary assessment of this man the like of whom does not exist among the living, whether he is a very great man or not."(4)

When Klausner became the editor of Ha-Shiloah he gave Brenner the chance to appear in the monthly, the best literary platform of that time. He accepted Brenner's longest novel "Ba-horef" and it was published in instalments in volumes 11-12. Klausner had believed in the talent of the young Brenner long before that; he had devoted an article in his series "Sifrutenu" to a review of some of Brenner's short stories. He was, it is true, very harsh in pointing out the defects of his style:

"The style of Mr. Brenner is very bad... This is not at all a Hebrew language but rather a corrupt 'jargon'. In this jargon is written not only the dialogue in which the writer could claim that he wanted to imitate the language of the masses, but also all the external descriptions and characterizations and even the empty and gratuitous philosophizing of the narrator himself... A young writer needs a faithful editor who can correct his style easily."(5)

Now he had the chance to be that editor.

Klausner was not the only person to receive Brenner with enthusiasm. In his letter to Klausner Bialik wrote commenting on Lugh Ahiasaf for the year 1903 which had

---

(4) Kol Kitve Brenner, vol. ii, 1960, p.138.

(5) Klausner: "Sifrutenu", Ha-Shiloah vii, 174-175.

been edited by Klausner: "... Brenner is a very mature talent and most certainly in the course of time he will be most significant. For the time being I do not see any young Hebrew writer like him."<sup>(6)</sup> This favourable reception and warm appreciation were developed when Bialik became the editor of the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah. After receiving the story "Ma-saviv la-nequdah" which appeared in four instalments in volume 14, he wrote to Brenner:

"Your story - which is a kind of continuation of "Ba-horef" will probably make an impression. I have read it only once, nevertheless I can say decidedly that you are the real Hebrew writer of our time in the widest sense of the words... Please try to improve your language. Stories of this kind are difficult to write - but once they are already written it is possible to delay them at home and to improve, polish and perfect them - by doing that you will gain much. You have a language of your own - but it is notable for its slackness."<sup>(7)</sup>

This enthusiasm did not last long, apparently because Brenner did not respond to the instructions of his editors. Commenting on one of his stories which appeared in volume 15, Bialik wrote in a letter to Klausner:

"'Rishme derekh' of Brenner did not come out satisfactorily this time. It is enough to look at the corrections and omissions which I carried out in his sketch in order to know how Hebrew writers write and how editors correct. Alas for our literature and for our writers who have fallen so low."<sup>(8)</sup>

---

(6) 'Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.183.

(7) Ibid., p.269.

(8) Ibid., pp.279-280.

To Brenner himself he wrote:

"Your latest work is superficial and poor in its substance, form and language. Perhaps it is worthy for Ha-Shiloah after all the changes which I had inserted, but I am entitled to ask you to do better than that, my friend.. Please do not spoil your way! Be careful, cautious and meticulous in your literary work. Be as accurate with yourself as a hairsbreadth. Why this slackness? I do not want to see you fail for ever."(9)

When Brenner sent his drama "<sup>c</sup>Erev u-voger" for publication in volume 18 of Ha-Shiloah he asked Bialik to reduce his editorial corrections. The latter replied:

"As I do not consider Ha-Shiloah the private property of the editor, so also I do not regard it as the private property of the writer - and this attitude puts both the editor and all his contributors under certain obligations from which they cannot be exempted."(10)

When Brenner turned to publicistics and became involved in a debate that he considered unnecessary, Bialik criticized him severely. He wrote:

"Brenner, that modest and honest man, who writes very good stories in a very careless style, has suddenly cast himself as a 'hero'... Brenner should concentrate on writing good stories and improve his faulty style."(11)

Brenner did not accept all these remarks and this severe criticism of his style. To prove that he had never been careless in his writing he replied in a letter to Bialik about his comment on the sketch

---

(9) Ibid., p.283.

(10) Ibid., vol. ii, p.65.

(11) Bialik: "<sup>c</sup>Ta'ut ne'imah", Ha-Shiloah, xix, 380.

"Men ha-Zawit," published in volume 13 of Ha-Shiloah under the title "Ha-yerushalmi":

"Regarding the sketch itself I can tell you that I have worked hard in writing it, redrafting it several times, and I have shortened it to almost half the original form. I cannot do any better. After all, my aspiration is greater than my ability."(12)

In another letter to Klausner he wrote:

"I am writing as I am able. All the time, I feel that my talent is not so great. I know better than anyone how limited is my ability because certainly I know what I want to say and what I am actually saying."(13)

Another writer who built up his literary popularity in Ha-Shiloah was Jacob Cohen. He was only 22 years old when his name appeared for the first time in Ha-Shiloah with his poem "Sheqi<sup>c</sup> at ha-hammah" in volume 11. Sixteen of his poems were published in volumes 11-20 of Ha-Shiloah, most of them edited by Bialik. Bialik described Cohen's poems:

"They have a kind of softness and transparency. A unique lightness is poured out of his poems like the rejuvenation of spring or the morning mist - in brief, it is indeed perfect poetry. The rhyme is airy and could be swallowed pleasantly like manna. Fine scent of citron is wafted from it, and the metre is like soft, delicate, pure and modest music. This man is playing on a fine string."(14)

Cohen was one of a group of writers who were in their early youth when Ahad Ha-Am<sup>c</sup> began to publish

---

(12) Kol Kitve Brenner, vol. iii, p.331.

(13) Ibid., p.388.

(14) Iggerot Bialik, vol. i, p.183-184.



Ha-Shiloah. Another of this group was I.D. Berkowitz who developed from the beginning of his career a strong friendship with Bialik of whom he was a great admirer. When Bialik was the editor of the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah, Berkowitz, then only 18 years old, was one of the first to be approached for a possible contribution. He did not contribute much; only three short stories by him appeared in Ha-Shiloah. The most important, not only of these three stories but also of his entire work is "Talush" which appeared in volume 14. It was praised by Bialik as:

"An immaculate pearl. Well done, you have revived me. Out of the large number of untalented and narrow-minded people who gather at the doors of our literature every day and turn it into a shambles in the eyes of the wise - there finally appears your genuine talent, growing, improving and deepening before us. May you continue to grow." (15)

Since his story "*Moshkele hazir*" had won the first prize for the best short story in the competition held by the daily Ha-Sofeh in 1903, all contemporary periodicals and critics took much interest in publishing his works or discussing them.

Another member of this group was J. Fishman the well known critic who edited the section of belles lettres in volumes 45-46 of Ha-Shiloah. His contribution was mostly to the poetry section.

From the relatively old school of Hebrew and Yiddish writers were Peretz and Mendele. The former published

---

(15) Ibid., p.263.

three poems, three plays, two stories, one sketch and three articles in volumes 11-25 of Ha-Shiloah. The latter completed his longest story "*Be Cemeq ha-Bakhah*" in volumes 17 and 19; he published the Hebrew version of his second longest story "*Susat*" in volumes 20-21, as well as two of his short stories: "*HashC arah*" in volume 15 and "*Shabbat*" in volume 24.

Frischmann contributed to this section only one story "*Ha-golem*" in volume 16 which had already appeared in Yiddish. Bialik's efforts did not succeed in attracting Frischmann to write more for Ha-Shiloah because he asked for a high honorarium which a monthly, like Ha-Shiloah could not afford. The same happened with Berdyczewski who was invited among others to work in Ha-Shiloah when Bialik became editor of the section on belles lettres. Berdyczewski promised to do so if Bialik would assure him that he is fully responsible for his section - Berdyczewski would have nothing to do with Klausner. When he received that assurance he sent the story "*Qais we-horef*" to Bialik, but he rejected it although he claimed to admire it. Berdyczewski was not at all happy about this attitude and he wrote to Bialik:

"If you find me fit to work in Ha-Shiloah from now on... these will be my conditions: the guilt of *Ahiasaf* against me should be atoned by paying me the maximum fees which *Ahiasaf* pays - that is to say, 50 roubles for each quire... I also want 300 roubles on account, a hundred each month, and I will undertake to write for you six quires." (16)

Bialik's answer was:

"With all my heart and soul I want you to work with me in Ha-Shiloah. But it pays only what it can afford, and this does not depend either on me or on the owners of Ahiasaf."(17)

In another letter he wrote:

"I very much regret to see you withdraw your support only for a monetary reason; but there is nothing I can do despite my desire to meet your demand: the treasury of Ahiasaf is completely empty and it will not be full in the near future. I want you to bear in mind the fact that literature is not for the sake of Tushiyah or Ahiasaf but for us, for me and you and the rest of our fellow-writers."(18)

After some time Berdyczewski sent Bialik his book Hayyē Mosheh 'ish 'elohim wi-yehoshu'a which was based on Jewish legend, seeking his opinion as a friend. Bialik advised him that it was neither the right time nor the right method to dispute what is written in the Bible. When Ha-Shiloah resumed publication in 1907 Bialik renewed his invitation to Berdyczewski to write for Ha-Shiloah and the latter sent him the story "Aggadat ha-metah." This appeared in volume 16 and was the only work by him to appear in Ha-Shiloah after the period of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am.

In addition to these different categories of bellettrists there was another group of writers who could be described as the Palestinian group. They took

---

(17) 'Iggerot B., Vol. i, p.219.

(18) Ibid., p.213.

the first steps in their literary career in Ha-Shiloah, but developed later in the Palestinian press. Among these were Hayyim Hazaz, S.Y. Agnon, Mosheh Smilanski, A. Shlonsky, U.Z. Grenberg and Deborah Baron.

As for Bialik himself, he can be considered the major contributor to this section since twenty-two poems and three stories by him were published in volumes 11-25. Afterwards he was busily engaged in his activities as publisher and did not write much. The most important of his poems were "*Megillat ha-'esh*", "*Lifné 'aron ha-sefarim*", "*Hakhnisei tahat kenafayikh*", "*Mi-shiré 'am*", "*qumi se'i*" and "*Shamayim biggshu rahamim 'alay*". His stories were "*Mishe-lanu*" in volume 11 and signed by the name A. Soher, "*Safyah*" in volume 15, and "*Me-'ahoré ha-geder*" in volume 21. Bialik influenced the young generation of Hebrew writers not only through his technique but also through his language. He freed the language from Biblical "*melitsah*", for to him language was a living organism and its expansion was derived from natural growth and development rather than the arbitrary addition of new words.

## 2. Publicistics:

This section too was extended by Klausner to cover a wide range of subjects of a universal as well as Jewish nature. Apart from discussions on the Zionist movement, its various aspects and everything related to it - which was a continuation of the previous policy

adopted by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am - he introduced some alterations in the monthly review. It was divided - as before - into two parts, current affairs and a review of literary activities.

The "*Hashqafah kelalit*" was maintained in the first volume edited by Klausner and was written by S. Lewin who had contributed the monthly review in the last two volumes of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's period. The main concern of this column under the editorship of Klausner was to discuss general matters. For reasons that are unknown the column did not appear in volumes 12-13; it reappeared in volume 14 and was written by A. Ludvipol. As for Jewish events, there were two columns, "*Hashqafah <sup>C</sup>ivrit*" was written by Klausner under the pseudonym "*Ha-Mashqif*" throughout volumes 11-21, 26; then it was replaced by the column "*Bi-tefusot yisra'el*" written by M. Kleinman in volumes 22-31. The cultural events and literary aspects of modern Hebrew literature were discussed in the column "*Hashqafah sifrutit*" written by Ehrenpreis who had contributed the monthly review in the early period of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's editorship. This column did not continue long; it appeared only in volumes 11-13 and was then replaced by critical articles or bibliographies.

The two columns: "*Mahshavot u-ma<sup>C</sup>asim*" and "*Yalqut qatan*" continued to appear irregularly until volume 24. From volume 28 onwards Klausner edited another column entitled "*Qeren Zawit*". In it he

reviewed current general events and their effect on Jewish life.

It was in the publicistic section of Ha-Shiloah that a strong opposition to the idea of a Jewish state in Uganda was voiced. Unlike other contemporary Hebrew periodicals, the monthly stood firmly against it. In volumes 12-15 Ahad Ha-CAm and Klausner took the lead in the challenge against political Zionism, for although Klausner himself was a political Zionist he allowed the publication of criticism against the leadership of the movement and its attitude towards Palestine.

Palestine and the co-existence between Arab population and Jewish settlers was a major subject for discussion in Ha-Shiloah. The most significant columns in which this issue was discussed were: "*Me-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volumes 12-14, 31 and "*Mikhtavim me-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volumes 20-24 by J. Barzilai, and "*Olam mithawweh*" by Klausner in volumes 27-31. Another writer who took an important part in discussing the affairs of Jewish settlers was Mosheh Smilanski in articles like: "*Li-she'elot ha-yishshuv be-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volume 14, "*Ha-masav ha-nokhah shel ha-yishshuv be-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volume 15, "*Mikhtavim me-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volume 16 and "*Le-toledot ha-yishshuv be-'eres Yiśra'el*" in volume 17. Even his stories were devoted to aspects of Palestinian life. Klausner's object was to give a better understanding of the circumstances in which the settlers lived, while Ahad Ha-CAm concentrated on a discussion of their problems.

Another decisive issue discussed in Ha-Shiloah led to a very important debate about the future of Judaism. This debate was caused by the article "*le-she'elat giyyum ha-yahadut*" by Saul Horowitz in volume 13. In it he expressed his doubts about the possibility of the continuance of separate existence of Jewry in the midst of a flourishing European civilization exerting strong influence upon its individual members. He criticized all the efforts which were being made to convert the Jew into an active member of the society in which he lived in order to avoid being a target for external pressure. He declared that the scope of Judaism should be widened and that rebellious opinions should be allowed within the community. The articles called forth numerous replies and refutations and acted as stimulus for the publicistic and essayistic literature in Ha-Shiloah.

### 3. Criticism:

Hebrew literature in general and belles lettres in particular were looked upon as an important element of the creativeness of Hebrew writers and it consequently became a subject for detailed analysis and discussion. There was a fundamental difference between this section in the period of *Ahad Ha-Cam* and that of Klausner. The latter gave the younger generation of Hebrew writers, who were not satisfied with reviewing stories and poems and pointing out their deficiencies or good

qualities, the opportunity to lay down canons and rules for their art, and to discuss the principles of the composition of fiction and poetry. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's search for good quality in literary criticism led to the publication only of reviews on new books, while Klausner allowed his critics to discuss any issue they liked.

Apart from Klausner himself who was the central pillar of this section since the foundation of Ha-Shiloah there arose a new generation of Hebrew critics who built their reputation in Ha-Shiloah. The most distinguished among them was Menahem Mendel Feitelson. He committed suicide after being insulted by Mendele as a result of the article in which he stated that Mendele was influenced in his style and technique by Russian writers.<sup>(19)</sup> The basic criterion that he employed in his judgement on writers and their works was the extent of the influence they exerted on their environment and the degree to which the ideas they preached or presented conformed to reality and life. He started his contribution to Ha-Shiloah with an objective article of two instalments on P. Smolenskin, his nationalistic views and the literary values of his work in volume 12. Another important article was a discussion of a new book of poems by Z. Shneour. This article entitled "Sevel ha-yerushah", appeared in volume 17. In it he criticized Shneour for ignoring Jewish life and the national movement while devoting almost all his poems to aspects

---

(19) Feitelson, M.M.: "Mi-mishpat Shalom<sup>c</sup>ad ba-yamim he-hem," Ha-Shiloah, xxiv, p.447.



like nature, beauty and love. Although Feitelson did not contribute much to Ha-Shiloah, his articles were of great significance because they presented a new trend in the field of literary criticism. His views were well expressed in an easy style and logical argument.

Another outstanding critic who resumed his contribution to the Ha-Shiloah of Klausner was Ehrenpreis. He had been well-known for his strong opposition to Ahad Ha-Cam's literary views, and he had spoken out in the first volume of Ha-Shiloah against limiting the scope of literature in the monthly to themes that bear some relation to Jews and Judaism. Instead he demanded a thoroughly secular national literature. His enthusiasm did not last long, and the outcome was disappointment and a pessimistic view of Hebrew literature. This view was reflected in his article "*Ha-sifrut ha-'illemet*" in volume 17. In it he wrote:

"Recent events have made us suddenly realize that we are like a candle which has been kindled at both ends at the same time. The old generation is like leaves which fall off the tree in the autumn after being blown by the first wind, while the younger generation, for whom we had hoped, has alternately shunned and approached us, has taken one step forward and two steps backward, and most have gone to the place 'from which there is no return'. Our work has therefore hung upon nothing: we thought we were a people, but we are not, that our literature has a public of listeners who have knowledge - but it has not. The reading public for our modern literature was from the beginning a small public... Most readers were of the type of "*baCalé battim*" and young gentlemen who read casually and whose requirement from literature was only the old book in a new wrapper. A public of this kind cannot, obviously, have much influence on literary

productivity by renewing it and widening its scope. Only the few young writers who have either remained or came back to us, were the leaven and the fuel of the machine of our development... Because the aim of our work was the search for the redeeming synthesis of Judaism and Europeanism, we now face a struggle on two fronts: with the old generation which is denying Europeanism and with the young generation which is denying Judaism." (20)

In the Ha-Shiloah of Ahad Ha-Cam we have seen Bialik explore his talent in the field of story writing; now, like many of his contemporaries, he wanted to exercise his abilities as a critic. However, it was not their critical value which made essays like "Havale' lashon" in volume 18, or "Ha-sefer ha-Civri" in volume 29, and "Shiratenu ha-Se'irah" in volume 17, very famous but rather their literary qualities and the comprehensive knowledge of the various phases of Jewish literature that was reflected in them.

Klausner too contributed a great number of articles to this section either as obituary articles about dead writers or in anniversaries of their death or of their literary activity. In addition to this he reviewed several books and periodicals. He also devoted a great deal of discussion to the literary abilities of writers like Ahad Ha-Cam, Mendele, Tchernichowsky and others. The essays were collected afterwards in his book Yasrim u-vonim. There was hardly any writer or work of any significance that was not analysed in detail by Klausner in a very skilful manner. It was also Klausner's

---

(20) Ehrenpreis: "Ha-sifrut ha-'illemet", Ha-Shiloah xvii, 395.

idea to dedicate complete issues to certain literary occasions.

As for the criticism of non-Jewish cultural and literary events and of general literary aspects, Klausner opened the doors of Ha-Shiloah to any writer who wanted to discuss these aspects whether he was an amateur or a professional critic. Nevertheless, most of the articles that appeared either dealt with Jewish aspects or were written by Jewish writers in European languages.

Exceptions were the articles: "*Ha-tragediyyah ha-yewanit*" in volume 23 and "*Shiré Homeros*" in volume 27 both by Leon Simon, and "*Ha-sifrut we-ha-<sup>C</sup>ittonut ha-Spaniolit*" in volume 26 by A. Elmaleh. In this the Ha-Shiloah of Klausner was not different from that of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am. In this category one may also include the columns: "*Min ha-<sup>C</sup>olam ha-gadol*" by N. Birnbaum in volumes 14-15, "*Min ha-sifrut ha yehudit ba-lashon anglit*" by A.S. Waldstein in volume 15, "*Mi-sifrut ha-ma<sup>C</sup>arav*" by Y.N. Shamhoni in volume 28, and "*Ba-sifrut ha-kelalit*" by N. Sokolow in volumes 20, 22, 24. About 15-20 pages of each issue were devoted to critical articles.

#### 4. Articles on science:

During this period Ha-Shiloah provided Klausner with a platform to state what he had to state without having to worry about the attitude of editors towards his work, its style and its contents. In the section of scientific literature in Ha-Shiloah Klausner published

idea to dedicate complete issues to certain literary occasions.

As for the criticism of non-Jewish cultural and literary events and of general literary aspects, Klausner opened the doors of Ha-Shiloah to any writer who wanted to discuss these aspects whether he was an amateur or a professional critic. Nevertheless, most of the articles that appeared either dealt with Jewish aspects or were written by Jewish writers in European languages.

Exceptions were the articles: "*Ha-tragediyyah ha-yewanit*" in volume 23 and "*Shiré Homeros*" in volume 27 both by Leon Simon, and "*Ha-sifrut we-ha-<sup>C</sup>ittonut ha-Spaniolit*" in volume 26 by A. Elmaleh. In this the Ha-Shiloah of Klausner was not different from that of *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am*. In this category one may also include the columns: "*Min ha-<sup>C</sup>olam ha-gadol*" by N. Birnbaum in volumes 14-15, "*Min ha-sifrut ha yehudit ba-lashon anglit*" by A.S. Waldstein in volume 15, "*Mi-sifrut ha-ma<sup>C</sup>arav*" by Y.N. Shamhoni in volume 28, and "*Ba-sifrut ha-kelalit*" by N. Sokolow in volumes 20, 22, 24. About 15-20 pages of each issue were devoted to critical articles.

#### 4. Articles on science:

During this period Ha-Shiloah provided Klausner with a platform to state what he had to state without having to worry about the attitude of editors towards his work, its style and its contents. In the section of scientific literature in Ha-Shiloah Klausner published

complete books in serial form like: "*Ha-ra<sup>C</sup>ayon ha-meshihi be yisra'el*" in volumes 12, 16, 18; it was completed in volumes published in Palestine. In it he also published long articles like: "*Kitvé ha-yetedot we-khitvé ha-qodesh*" in volume 11, "*Reshimot munahim<sup>C</sup>iveriyyim*" in volume 32, "*Torat ha-middot ha-qedumot be yisra'el*" in volume 33 and three chapters of his book Historeyah Yisra'elit in volume 36.

Two of the outstanding participants in this section in the period of *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am* had been S. Bernfeld and D. Neumark; both continued to contribute to it during Klausner's editorship. Like the other sections, this section also attracted many new talents. F. Lipschütz wrote on economic and political science, A.Z. Idelson on the Aramaic language, M.Z. Segal on the blood accusation of Damascus, A. Hazan on the Pentateuch and Bar-Tuvia (Jacob Frankel) on sociology. The subjects treated in this section were almost the same as in *Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am*'s period; but the space allocated to this section was reduced to 20-25 pages in each issue.

Klausner did not succeed in carrying out his programme regarding this section because of the lack of interest among Hebrew writers in the type of scientific work he wanted. The few articles which discussed general matters were, more or less, reviews of works written in European languages.

CHAPTER IV  
CONCLUSIONS

At the turn of the century journalistic writing grew more rapidly in Hebrew than in other languages and its importance for the development of Jewish intellectual life was more significant for Hebrew literature than in any other literature. At this period, with so much discussion of current affairs - the special contribution of monthlies was appreciated. The role of a monthly was to review, discuss and invariably analyse trends of events rather than isolated happenings. These periodicals formed the battle-ground on which writers championed their different views. They also served as a medium through which instruction was imparted. It is in these periodicals too that most Hebrew literature was published where the different views were expressed, and contemporary problems were discussed. The Hebrew reading public was scattered in various countries and had been brought up on various systems of culture and education. Their literary taste differed accordingly, and since it was the only source for obtaining Jewish knowledge, periodical literature did not please all its readers.

"Every single article was both condemned outright and praised to the skies; what one critic liked best another disliked most heartily and vice versa."(1)

---

(1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.159.

Most of the blame for the low standard of Hebrew literature was laid on the readers, but the writers were equally responsible. Frequent complaints were heard about the poor quality of their work and their failure to supply the readers with what they wanted. The result was that some readers were constrained to desert Hebrew for Yiddish or for their vernacular. The lack of talented writers on which a scholarly journal would depend, was described once by Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am:

"We have scarcely any literature or any writers or even any honourable people who can write two or three pages properly... I mean what would pass for 'properly' in any other language than Hebrew... what is worse, the less their ability, the greater their conceit. Most of them (there are few exceptions) think that any empty phrase or inspired pleasantry of theirs is a pearl of wisdom which it is sacrilege to touch." (2)

The Hebrew periodical press in Russia may be considered to be the most important because of the size of Russian Jewry towards the end of the 19th century. It was faced sometimes with setbacks either because of the strictness of the censorship or because of the lack of funds. Moreover, the strong rivalry from Yiddish and Russian Jewish periodicals affected the chances of success of the Hebrew periodicals; they wandered from one city to another according to necessity. Furthermore, the rivalry between Hebrew literary centres encouraged those Jewish communities to publish their own periodicals. In some cases periodicals

---

(2) Ibid., p.174.

were published outside Russia while circulating mainly in Russia. Ha-Shiloah was among those, since for some time it was published in Berlin and Cracow.

In 1896 the situation of Hebrew periodicals in Europe was poor - indeed there was no periodical of serious standing in existence. Several attempts had been made to publish Hebrew monthlies, but none had succeeded. All the periodicals which had been intended to be monthlies had either suspended publication prematurely or were forced to appear irregularly. This situation encouraged Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am to attempt to fill the gap with a moderate and serious Hebrew monthly. His attempt differed from all previous ventures of this nature for two reasons. In the first place its financial well-being was guaranteed by Wissotzky who had donated the capital resources for its publication and by Ahiasaf, the administrators of the periodical in Russia. In the second place its editor Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am was already a towering figure in Jewish cultural affairs. The choice of its name, Ha-Shiloah pointed to his desire for gradual progress in the social and cultural development of the Jewish people. The ancient brook, of this name, had already been invoked as a symbol of slow movement in Biblical time.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's editorial policy reflected his wish to concentrate only on Jewish aspects of culture and to pay little attention to universal human affairs. He wanted to edit Ha-Shiloah on the basis of Jewish



traditional ideas and according to the highest standard of European form. By stressing his desire not to make Ha-Shiloah the organ of any section of the public Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am felt that he could obtain the collaboration of a wider range of writers than would have been available for a periodical with a party label.

Ha-Shiloah met with a mixed reception. Many welcomed it and considered it a great step forward towards the modernization of Hebrew literature; others saw it as a retrograde step, limiting the Hebrew reader's knowledge. Among the latter were the 'Young Writers' who protested against the restriction on the scope of literature in Ha-Shiloah and demanded that European culture should be set before the Hebrew reader.

In his reply the editor did not deny the importance of general knowledge for Hebrew readers. On the contrary, he admitted that it is essential for them, but it was more essential that they should first know themselves. The human being in a Jewish image should be the sole concern of Hebrew literature. On the other hand, he stated that general knowledge is available in other languages for all those who may want it. Moreover he questioned the ability of the 'Young Writers' and challenged them to help to carry out the programme of Ha-Shiloah even with its limitations.

It is fair to say that the policy of Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am in limiting the scope of literature in Ha-Shiloah to subjects attributed to Jewishness was justifiable if

Ha-Shiloah was to be considered as a pedagogical medium. The fact that this controversy did not produce any outcome of literary benefit, despite the publicity given to it by Hebrew critics, is proof in itself. By accepting only what was original and creative in the field of Jewish studies during its first few years, Ha-Shiloah laid down a new and fundamental basis for Jewish literature. It sought to show the readers the way to a better understanding of their inner life as a step towards the full appreciation of general-human culture. This policy enabled Ha-Shiloah in subsequent years to admit translations and articles on non-Jewish aspects of literature and to accept art for its own sake without fear of the effect this policy might have on the reading public.

It is true that the policy of Ha-Shiloah affected its circulation. But it is equally true that its very small number of subscribers, resident all over the world, were very faithful to it and considered it as a high school in which they would mature and receive a suitable education. It succeeded from the beginning in creating a good image in the eyes of its few readers and contributors. It was considered an honour for writers of that time to participate in it. This was made possible by the determination of its editor not to give way either to the demands of the majority of Hebrew readers who were not used to a serious scholarly journal, or to the pressure of the publishers

who were concerned only about the financial side of the business and who wanted Ha-Shiloah to take a popular stance in discussing nationalistic matters. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's answer to this criticism was: "At the present time it is very likely that the course of Ha-Shiloah will have to be against the dominant current."<sup>(3)</sup> When Ahiasaf suggested to him, in 1901, that he should convert the monthly into a popular daily newspaper or a weekly in order to attract more subscribers Klausner wrote to him describing the attitude of most Hebrew readers towards Ha-Shiloah:

"If they (Ahiasaf) could come to Basle and see how great is the influence of Ha-Shiloah particularly as a scientific and literary monthly giving a great many instalments of important articles written with gravity, they would change their mind. I said already in my previous letter how much people talk about you and your monthly at every meeting here, and to what extent they value it. They consider it the only Jewish scientific organ."<sup>(4)</sup>

Ha-Shiloah was directed principally towards intelligent and educated readership. It was the first Hebrew periodical to employ the European methodology of journalism, and it is mainly in this that Hebrew critics and men of letters see the contribution of Ha-Shiloah to the development of Hebrew literature. The main impression that Ha-Shiloah desired to create in the minds of its readers through the arrangement of its material was a sense of the progressive development of Jewish

---

(3) Ibid., p.267

(4) Arkhiyon A.H./868II/1901.

studies and Hebrew literature during its own time.

Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am stated in a letter to one of his contributors:

"I want our scribblers to see how a European expounds his ideas, no matter whether they are correct or not."<sup>(5)</sup>

As editor Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am assumed a power and authority which were previously unknown in Hebrew literature. He appointed himself the supreme judge of literary taste and of the type of material which he was prepared to publish in his monthly. His insistence on printing the material in a good style was not because he was interested in style for its own sake, but in clarity of expression. In order to achieve this aim he allowed himself much freedom in correcting the style of his contributors. He considered himself responsible for the form in which the material would be presented in Ha-Shiloah. By doing this Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am believed that he was protecting Hebrew language and the taste of the Hebrew readers from being spoiled. And protecting the reputation of his contributors by preventing them from saying things in Ha-Shiloah which might lessen the reader's respect for them.

Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not show favour to any of his contributors; no-one was exempted from his severe treatment. Despite the resentment of most of them over his editorial corrections of their works, when they republished these works in separate volumes they

---

(5) 'Iggerot A.H., vol.i, p.184.

republished them as they had appeared in Ha-Shiloah, and not as they were originally written. This could be considered as acceptance of his editorial corrections as justifiable.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am did not accept for publication in Ha-Shiloah any personal attacks or even praise. He did not allow any of his writers to be abusive in language in order to depict certain of their critics. Nor did he allow them to become embroiled in personal vindictiveness. He wrote to one in this regard:

"I am very surprised that a man of education like you, after seeing, as you must have done from earlier numbers, how careful Ha-Shiloah is to avoid anything in the nature of personal attack, could imagine that I would accept an article written in this vein."(6)

This dignified attitude of Ha-Shiloah was echoed in contemporary Hebrew periodicals. They changed the tone of their criticism from the subjective into the objective. On this change Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am wrote in one of his letters:

"I have read the criticism against me in Ha-Sefirah almost with delight, because I saw in its style, which is very different from the usual polemical style of this periodical, an attempt to show that they too know the rules of good manners. Therefore I claim merit for myself because Ha-Shiloah has had influence also on the improvement in the contents of the daily newspapers."(7)

---

(6) Ibid., p.177.

(7) Ibid., p.182.

The discussion of controversial political matters often prompted lively debates in Ha-Shiloah. One of the earliest controversies treated in Ha-Shiloah was the outcome of the First Zionist Congress. The antagonism of the journal towards Herzl and political Zionism is surprising in view of the respect he enjoyed among the majority of the Hebrew readers who were the public of Ha-Shiloah. His death in 1904 was almost passed over in silence by the journal which closely adhered to the policy of spiritual Zionism. It also adopted a middle path between the orthodox and progressive approaches in the field of religious studies. This policy enabled it to seek the support of a wider range of contributors and to address itself to a broader audience.

Despite polemics of this sort the articles as a whole reveal a true scholarly approach. They aimed to provide a historical and scientific foundation for the interest that prevailed during the revival of Hebrew literature in all that was related to Jewishness.

Although Ha-Shiloah was far from being a financial success Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am did not accept any donations. He even refused the suggestion that copies should be sent to rich Jews who might help the paper financially. This high moral attitude was expressed in one of his letters. He wrote:

"There is a great difference between myself and other editors who have successfully struggled through. They were willing to accept subsidies, to beg help from famous institutions, to make lavish promises to their contributors and readers without worrying whether they would be able to fulfil them. I could not do these things even if it were legitimate to do them for the sake of Hebrew literature." (8)

The primary aim of belles lettres in Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am's Ha-Shiloah was clearly a didactic-moral one. Fiction was to be a vehicle to teach a moral lesson and to promote religious values. Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am wanted to offset what he considered to be the pernicious effect of the romantic European literature which was widely spread among his contemporaries. The importance of artistic language for fiction was not overlooked. Skill in description and in the portrayal of noble emotions were qualities for which he looked.

As for criticism, there were the detailed studies of individual writers of the 19th and early 20th centuries, or of their works. Also there were the detailed critiques of newly published works of several writers. Sometimes articles in this section were a reason for the dissatisfaction of writers who were the object of their criticism. Ahad Ha-C<sup>c</sup>Am's comment on the complaint of one of them was:

"It is surprising to me that Jewish scholars cannot tolerate a word of adverse criticism. Why are non-Jewish scholars different? Their books are reviewed by critics galore, some learned and some not, but they take it all quietly and do not answer back." (9)

---

(8) Ibid., p.224.

(9) Ibid., p.191.

It was due to the will power and strong influence of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am that he succeeded in establishing the most important Hebrew periodical of the time and in maintaining its literary standard at the level of any European periodical. When he realized that Ha-Shiloah might be more successful without him, he resigned the editorship at the end of 1902, and Klausner, one of his leading disciples, succeeded him as its editor. This appointment, however, met with strong opposition from some writers who considered Klausner too inexperienced to take the place of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am.

The new editor introduced substantial changes in the policy of the paper. These changes annoyed not only Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am but also some of the leading Hebrew writers. It was not long before Klausner himself came under criticism from various sections of the reading public for his failure to carry out these changes. However, Ha-Shiloah under the editorship of Klausner may be considered as a new publication and not as a continuation of the previous period. The one characteristic of Ha-Shiloah which was not affected by the change of editor was the complete freedom of expression provided that views were expressed clearly and in a good style. It fought for its own concepts, but also found space for the important opposing concepts of others.

While Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's role in Ha-Shiloah was mainly editorial, and he himself contributed little to the



journal, Klausner, on the other hand, did not interfere much in the work of others and devoted all his time to writing. Most of his scientific and literary works were published in the monthly during the period of his editorship. Over 124 separate entries are listed under his name in the general index of Ha-Shiloah. The list includes some major works, first appearing in serial form in the journal and later in separate volumes. Impressive, too, is the range of his work. Articles signed with his name and others under pen-names encompass Ha-Shiloah's entire range of subjects.

The relative success of Ha-Shiloah during the editorship of Klausner was partly due to the extensive attention paid to it by H. Katzenelson who was its administrator from 1907 until its last issue.

Bialik, who may be considered as the most important contributor to the section of belles lettres in Ha-Shiloah, edited this section from 1904 to 1909. From the beginning of his editorial career he followed the same policy as Ahad Ha-<sup>o</sup>Am correcting or even rejecting material if it did not meet his own requirements. Because of the respect Bialik enjoyed among Hebrew writers, particularly the young, his section attracted many writers who accepted willingly his editorial corrections. To some of them he acted as teacher and instructor. He even became the printer of Ha-Shiloah from 1907.

The constant misunderstanding between Klausner and

Bialik led to the resignation of the latter from the editorship at the end of 1909. Klausner continued as sole editor of the paper.

Ha-Shiloah was the first Hebrew periodical to appear continuously, with some brief intervals, for thirty years (1896-1927). Despite its financial and administrative problems, its achievements in the literary field were immense. It included works by many writers not a few of whom were important figures in Hebrew letters. In it was cultivated a new school of Hebrew writers who were and still are highly respected and considered as fathers of present-day Hebrew literature. Names like Bialik, Tchernichowsky, Shimoni, Shneour and Cohen in poetry; Mendele, Feuerberg, Berkowitz, S. Ben-Zion and Secco in fiction; Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Lewinsky and Ehrenpreis in publicistics; Rawnitzki, Klausner and Feitelson in criticism; and Bernfeld, Kahana, Neumark and Tchernowitz in scientific literature played an important role in the development of Hebrew literature. Ha-Shiloah also trained a new generation of Hebrew readers who nourished good literary taste in it. Through it a deep knowledge of the outside world was made available to Hebrew readers. It offered its readers the literary treasures of periods of the Jewish history long neglected by Jewish scholars.

Ha-Shiloah was the forerunner of those journals which participated in the work of diffusing light and learning among Jewish communities, not only in Russia,

but also all over the world. The financial difficulties encountered in publishing it, the shortage of learned contributors and the competition that resulted from an increase of Hebrew periodicals did not affect the determination of its editors to continue their struggle for the fulfilment of their aim.

EXCURSUS (A)

HA-SHAHAR AND HA-SHILOAH:

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

When J. Zeitlin, Wissotzky's son-in-law, expressed to Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am his hope to see Ha-Shiloah as successful and popular as was Ha-Shahar, Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am replied very firmly:

"If I thought that Ha-Shiloah was going to be like Ha-Shahar, I should not have the strength to slave for it as I do. Whether the articles are good or only reasonable is a question which everybody may answer according to his taste, but this I will guarantee - in a thousand pages of Ha-Shiloah European readers will not find as much 'batlanut' and twaddle as in any single number of Ha-Shahar."(1)

In another letter to Ahiasaf he explained:

"If I were writing like Smolenskin, I should have found in the eight comments of my column (Yalqut gatan) in the fourth issue (of volume I), enough material for eight articles which would fill at least, four quires,"(2)

Moreover, he denied being influenced by Smolenskin or Ha-Shahar when he wrote:

"There were some writers who related me to the disciples of Smolenskin. The fact is that I had not read or even seen Ha-Shahar or any of Smolenskin's works until I settled in Odessa at the age of thirty. Then I was already a man of a certain philosophy of my own obtained from completely different sources."(3)

- 
- (1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.166  
 (2) Ibid., p.175  
 (3) Kol Kitve' A.H., p.481

Ha-Shiloah was the first Hebrew monthly, after Ha-Shahar, to survive long and to exert tremendous influence upon the mental development of younger generations of Hebrew readers. It lived thirty years while Ha-Shahar lived seventeen years, it produced forty-six volumes while Ha-Shahar produced twelve. Both of them were devoted to literature, science and publicistics. During the twelve years interval between the death of Ha-Shahar and the birth of Ha-Shiloah there was not a single Hebrew monthly of any standard and influence except Mi-Mizrah umi-Ma<sup>c</sup>arav. This literary and scientific monthly was established in Vienna by R. Brainin in 1894. It continued in an irregular manner in Cracow and Berlin until 1899, but only four numbers appeared. Its programme was quite similar to that of Ha-Shiloah except that Mi-Mizrah umi-Ma<sup>c</sup>arav admitted material on both Jewish and general - human aspects of literature and discussed Jewish and non-Jewish personalities on equal terms. Like Ha-Shahar Mi-Mizrah umi-Ma<sup>c</sup>arav was also the work of an individual. It was meant to be the organ of a new trend in Modern Hebrew literature which called for cultural assimilation of the Jews. This trend was called "*Ha-Mahlakh he-hadash*", introduced and championed by Ben-Avigdor in 1891 with the publication of his series of literary books under the general title "*Séfré Agorah*" which aimed at the free development of Hebrew literature on the basis of universal human civilization.

The main object of both Ha-Shahar and Ha-Shiloah was to educate the readers through the revival of Jewish culture and the Hebrew language. They adopted different methods to achieve this common aim, not only because of the different circumstances but also because of the different nature and philosophy of their editors. Ha-Shahar, like Ha-Shiloah, published scientific articles. But while Smolenskin was ready to publish in his monthly useless as well as useful scientific articles, Ahad Ha-Cam published only articles which could be useful for educating the enlightened Hebrew readers and for popularizing science among them. (4) Smolenskin's aim was from the beginning to criticize those who opposed enlightenment; and later on he became with his monthly the spokesman of Jewish nationalism and Hibbat Zion. Ha-Shiloah was from the beginning a nationalist and Zionist monthly. And on the literary front it was the journal of those who knew languages other than Hebrew. It was not devoted to those who wanted a Hebrew periodical only for diversion, those who wanted to enjoy the beauty and purity of the language. Most of its readers had also a knowledge of foreign literatures and they insisted on substantial content and literary taste. (5)

There was also a great difference between the

---

(4) Klausner: Le-Zikhro shel Ahad Ha-Cam, 1957, p.27.

(5) Bernfeld: "Ha-sifrut ha-Cittit be-lashon Civrut," Ha-Shiloah, xvii, 304.

methods of editing the two monthlies. Smolenskin was interested only in the contents of the articles, poems and stories which he published in Ha-Shahar and he did not pay much attention to violations of grammatical and stylistic principles. Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, on the other hand, was very severe in editing his monthly. He insisted on the highest standard of the available material, while he also corrected the language and style of his contributors.

"A good editor does not mean one who pampers or exaggerates by praising the ability of the beginner. On the contrary, a good editor should be a real pedagogue, who does not exaggerate in his estimation of a new manuscript, but encourages its author by all means, even by serious critical remarks. He should acquire the confidence and the respect of his contributors." (6)

These characteristics were in Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am but not in Smolenskin. Perhaps this was the reason for the popularity of Ha-Shahar.

"Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am guides the generation, but his steps are so fast that we are not able to catch up with him, and it is not possible for us, the majority of the people, to learn his doctrine, because the distance between him and us is very long. Smolenskin was not like that. He too guided us, but our eyes were always able to see our teacher and our ears were always able to hear his voice. They say that the reason for Smolenskin's popularity among his readers is because he was not much superior to them in knowledge." (7)

Ha-Shahar addressed itself to the most sentimental section of the Hebrew reading public, and it attracted also the few talented and intelligent writers of that time. For that reason its influence was great.

---

(6) Cohen, Israel: Ketavim, vol. i, 1966, p.150.

(7) Feitelson, M.M.: "Peretz Smolenskin" Ha-Shiloah, xii, 26.

Ha-Shiloah, on the other hand, was of a very high standard and it was, unintentionally, suitable only for the élite among Hebrew readers. The attitude of the reading public towards Ha-Shiloah was therefore very restrained and cool compared with the welcome given to Ha-Shahar. The Hebrew reader was glad to have Ha-Shiloah which was as good as some important European periodicals, but he did not submit to its influence very easily and was not eager to submit to this new monthly even if it contained sometimes new ideas on Jewish matters with which he was not familiar.<sup>(8)</sup>

Regarding publicistic articles, Ha-Shiloah was similar to Ha-Shahar in its aspiration to give the enlightened Hebrew reader this type of material. But here too there was a great difference between them. Ha-Shiloah was superior to Ha-Shahar because of the large number of subjects discussed in this section, and their variety. As for belles lettres, Ha-Shiloah too was superior because it did not publish novels like "The Wanderer through the Paths of Life" and others, that were of great value only at the time of Smolenskin.<sup>(9)</sup>

Smolenskin's attitude towards poetry was similar to that of Ahad Ha-Cam. In the first phase of his editorial activity Smolenskin gave his condition for accepting poems: "They should be pleasant, free of

---

(8) Hacoheh, M. Ben Hillel: "Ha-Shahar mul Ha-Shiloah Ibid., vol. xxv, p.490.

(9) Bernfeld; Ha-Shiloah, vol. xvii, p.304.



grammatical errors: to this there will be no exception." (10)

As for the number of poems which he was prepared to accept, he wrote:

"There will be very few poems because very few readers want them: Only the best of poems on Jewish matters will be accepted and the rest will be rejected." (11)

He also made it clear that he would not accept any translated poems because "the time has come for us to write original works which will be translated into other languages." (12) In some cases he accepted translations of prose works provided that the book was written by a good and talented writer, or if the work dealt with Jewish matters. However, the ban was absolute on translations in the scientific section for fear that this might create among Hebrew readers a desire to read the work in its original language. He would then lose them as Hebrew readers. (13)

Like Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Smolenskin was constantly complaining of the low standard of his contributors. He would rather delay the publication of the issue than to fill it with poor and light material: "Who knows better than I, the great deal of nonsense which our writers produce, and which has exhausted me." (14)

---

(10) Brainin: Peretz ben Mosheh Smolenskin, Hayyaw u-sefaraw, p.52.

(11) Ha-Shahar, vol. ii, p.6.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Werses, "Ha-Sifrut ha-<sup>c</sup>ivrit Ba-aspaqlariyyah shel Ha-Shahar" Gilyonot xxvi, 357.

(14) Brainin, op.cit., p.139.

Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's refusal to accept a comparison between his monthly and Ha-Shahar may have been justifiable. His judgement, however, was anachronistic, because he judged Ha-Shahar from the viewpoint of his own generation without considering the fact that Ha-Shahar had prepared readers and writers for a monthly of the standard of Ha-Shiloah.

"If we read the twelve volumes of Ha-Shahar now we shall find, according to our literary taste and our point of view, some articles (they may be the majority) that do not suit our taste. The circumstances of our life have changed completely since the establishment of Ha-Shahar. Our views now are different from those of the seventies of the ~~passing~~ century. General enlightenment has spread among the Eastern Jews. Our literary and moral demands are now greater than those of the preceding generation. Hebrew literature in our time is no longer for entertainment only. It has to discuss solutions to the problems of our present life. This was not the case when Ha-Shahar was established." (15)

Despite all the defects in Ha-Shahar and in Smolenskin's editorial work, no one can deny the importance of Ha-Shahar and the role it played in the development of the Hebrew language and literature. Brainin defended Smolenskin against his severe critics when he wrote:

"Go and be a good, acceptable, polite and strict Hebrew editor, if you have no cash at all, and your only capital is your great desire to be beneficial to your people and its literature. Go and be a good editor, if you have no permanent assistants or contributors and you have to write to each writer who may volunteer to

work with you, seventy seven times urging him to write something for your paper... Go and suffer from the mistakes of all your contributors and their strange demands because they work for you for nothing. Go and correct their language and their style in all that needs to be corrected or changed, and at the end they will act angrily and shake heaven and earth because you dared to change a little in their words... As though these words were all ancient tradition... Each of your contributors presses to be the first to have his work published even if there are others whose works reached the editorial office first. Each of them will flood you with letters asking about the safe keeping of his articles even before the lack of free time could allow you to read them, as if he had entrusted you with his only son. The writer who has sent his article to you today may ask for it back tomorrow; today he allows you to publish it and tomorrow he may forbid you to do so... Go and be a proper editor if you reside here and your subscribers are in Spain, and each issue has to roll through a series of contretemps and pass through the seven regions of hell before it can reach their hands. Go and be a good editor if the subscribers on whom your eyes are set do not know what they need from Hebrew literature; each of them wants something different from you and wishes the whole issue to be written according to his own taste... as if all the efforts of the editor were only for him in return for his Sheqel which the editor will never see. In such strange circumstances, go and be an editor in accordance with your demands from Hebrew. Only then, when you are in his position, will you judge him aright."(16)

These were the words of a man who was not only a close assistant of Smolenskin but also had experienced the editorial work himself. They are evidence to how great was the suffering which a Hebrew editor had to bear in order to satisfy his own demands and those of his writers and readers.

---

(16) Brainin, op.cit., p.142.

## EXCURSUS (B)

THE STYLE OF AHAD HA-<sup>C</sup>AM

The style of Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was unique in certain respects. One can fully appreciate this only by comparing it with that of his contemporaries and bearing in mind that Hebrew was inactive at that time. Because of his authoritative position first in *Ahiasaf* and later in Ha-Shiloah, Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am took a dynamic part in directing the literary policy of Hebrew literature during the last decade of the 19th century and the first decade of the present century. He also educated a whole generation of Hebrew readers and writers with his philosophy and style. Indeed, by this style he created a scientific medium of analysis and presentation. In Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's style may be recognized the reflection of different periods of the language merged together in a complete harmony.

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was eager to use the language that suited his ideas and the pattern which suited the contents. To make sure that he would be fully understood, he would have his essays read before publication:

"I have never sent anything I have written to the printer without first having it read by one or two people whom I regard as competent judges (if I could find them; if not I am content with ordinary readers). I listen carefully to all their comments and mercilessly cut out or alter anything that impresses them unfavourably in one way or another, though it may seem alright

to me. This practice has saved me from using expressions which appealed to me because of their sarcasm, but which I should certainly have regretted afterwards if I had allowed them to appear in print."(1)

In his style one can feel his genuine faithfulness to his ideological views and therefore the careful choice of his language. He avoided using the worn phrases and the profuse quotations which most of his contemporaries employed in order to pad their writings. His style became a school for modern Hebrew prose.

"He never sacrificed thought to form in a language that is fascinating in its euphonic and over-rich in reading coined figures of speech. He meticulously avoided every shadow of exaggeration, preferring to incur the reproach of tediousness rather than to risk interesting but inexact expressions. His ascetic aloofness from all manners of word-jingling which is unhappily frequent in Hebrew has made him an authentic renovator of Hebrew."(2)

But the accuracy of Ahad Ha-Cam's style did not prevent him from being misunderstood by some of his contemporaries. Klausner wrote in a letter to him:

"I am your student and you have to explain to me the contradictions which I find in your writings. These contradictions had been found too by many others, some of whom are known to me and some are not. Is it possible that we all do not understand your writings? If so, then the fault is yours because you write in a way that the majority do not understand and you are obliged to explain your writings to the masses."(3)

More than any other writer, Ahad Ha-Cam could be regarded as the founder of a modern European-Hebrew

- 
- (1) 'Iggerot A.H., vol. i, p.222.
  - (2) Spiegel, Hebrew Reborn, p.282.
  - (3) 'Arkhiyon A.H. 7868I/18.6.1897

style, a monumental style with every word in its proper place in the sentence.

"Hebrew style before Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am was not genuine, and this caused the counterfeiting of thoughts either consciously or unconsciously. The reason for this was not only the poverty of Hebrew regarding words and expressions, but because our writers had a tendency to exaggeration and hyperbole. Then Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am proved that it is possible to write in Hebrew without much phraseology and fine words which do not clarify the matter but confuse it. He did not coin new words but introduced into Hebrew literature simplicity of style."(4)

Ahad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am did not believe in developing the language through the work of grammarians or by coining new words for their own sake. In his view that was the work of outstanding writers and philosophers.

"Our language in its present condition is not sufficient for our requirements. It is obvious that some writers should try to widen the scope of the language artificially, but those writers are concerned only with the lexical side of the problem. They think, it seems, that by coining new words our language will be rich like all European languages. But in fact this is not the main deficiency. What we really need is a general method for adapting each area of the fundamental material so that it can be formed into many different patterns, permanently and temporarily in order to express any idea in all its different and variable forms."(5)

If, then, those outstanding writers discuss serious matters, this will lead them to the necessity of having to coin new words, expressions and modern patterns of speech, all according to their requirements in order to express their thoughts well. And if their works

---

(4) Tahon, J: "Lo zeh ha-derkh", Ha-Shiloah, xxx, 212.

(5) Kol Kitve A.H., p.99.

attract readers, the latter will study them carefully and absorb the innovations in them. (6)

There is not a single essay by Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am from which one can omit a sentence without spoiling the meaning. Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am denied being influenced by any of the *Haskalah* writers, but

"there is no doubt that like all Odessan writers, he was influenced by Mendele. It seems, however, that Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am surpassed Mendele, in some cases, in the significance of his words, in his absolute control over his language which was subdued to ~~his absolute control over his language which was subdued to his~~ will and his requirements." (7)

Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's style was the product of a synthesis of modern European methods of expressing ideas with the traditional elements of Hebrew, a synthesis of analytical thought. He achieved this success with the help of continuous reading in the work of European philosophers. He was the first to introduce elasticity in the language of Hebrew publicistics. The sentence in Aḥad Ha-<sup>C</sup>Am's writings is not the traditional short sentence but a long one which can be divided into periods that move towards a delayed main clause. One of the reasons for preferring the long sentence is to avoid repeating the predicate, but if he fears that the subject will be forgotten he will repeat it after a dash:

---

(6) Ibid., p.96.

(7) Fishman, J.: 'Amat ha-Binyan, p.187.

" לפי שהקולוניות האלה אינן, כאסור, אלא אבנים לבנין העתיד  
 לבוא, אך כשהן לעצמן לא יוכלו עוד להחשב ככוח לאומי מרכזי  
 האר צורה חדשה לחיי העם כולו, בעוז שטוסז רוחני גדול בארץ-  
 ישראל אשר יקבצו אליו המון חכמים ובעלי כשרון מבני עמנו  
 לעבוד עבודתם ברוח ישראל, בלי לחץ והשפעה יתרה מן החוץ -  
 טוסז כזה מוכשר היה גם עתה לחדש רוח כל העם ולפתוח חיים  
 אפטיים בכל קניינינו הלאומיים. " ( כל כתבי אחד העם ,

עמ' קפ"א )

Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am considered a sentence of several clauses as a stylistic alternative to a sentence of a single clause. Unlike his contemporaries who often preferred to begin with a main statement adding qualifications afterwards, Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am chose to keep his readers in suspense and to create a sense of mystery in his essays:

" לא כל השאלות הקשות , שבני אדם מתחבטים בהן ואינם יכולים  
 למצוא הדרך לפתרונן, קשות הן באמת לפי עצם טבען . יש שגם  
 דברים פשוטים וברורים מצד עצמן נעשים קשים ומסובכים בזרן  
 מלאכותית, מתוך שנמצאו גואלים להם, שהשתדלו לבארם ולבררם,  
 יתר הרבה מכפי הצורך, עד שנעלם המושג הפשוט בין המון הסברות  
 הדקות שהעמיסו עליו . מן המין הזה הוא בלי ספק אותה  
 "השאלה הקשה" - שאלת הקולטורה. ( עמ' קע"ג )

One can see how strong is the relationship of the small units within the larger unit in Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am's sentence. Furthermore, the whole essay can only be read as one large unit because its paragraphs are connected to each other in a logical way.

Aḥad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, who was among the first to adopt the European system of punctuation, had been influenced by



the English system in this regard. If the relative clause or the parenthetical clause is very short he will put a comma before it and will not put it in brackets: (8)

" יודע אתה, כי רוצה אני, ואי אפשר שלא ארצה, שיהיה 'השלח' מכובד על הבריות גם לעתיד ולא יביישו הכרכים הבאים את ההולכים לפניהם. " (של"א)  
 " ואולם את חטאי זה, שאני מבחין בין ספק לודאי, היו 'צעירי הדור', כנראה, נושאים לי ברחמים, לולא מצאו בי עוד חטא אחר, הגדול בעיניהם מנשוא : כי הנני מבחין גם בין אפשר לנמנע. " (קכ"ט)

On the other hand he puts comma and not conjunctive waw before the last of three or more nouns or adjectives which come one after another. In doing that he follows the practice of the German and the Russian.

" פרקי חכמה, אשר יתנו מושגים נכבדים מחזיונות נכבדים שונים - דתיים, מוסריים, חברתיים, ספרותיים וכו'. .... " (קכ"ז)  
 " כי בכל הדורות האלה הגבירה היהדות את האידילא הרוחני המופשט, על הכח החמרי, הממשי, את "הספר" על "הסיף", ועל ידי זה הרחיקה מלב בני ישראל את השאיפה להתגברות הכח האישי, הכניעה את "החיים בעצם" לפני "צל החיים". (קנ"ד)

Sometimes he follows the Bible and the post-Biblical literature in putting the conjunction "waw" and not commas before the nouns and adjectives which follow one another:

" אבל מעט מעט ילמדוהו מקרי החיים להביט בעינים פקוחות לאחור,

---

(8) Klausner, J.: Ha-<sup>c</sup>ivrit ha-hadashah u-va<sup>c</sup>yotehah  
 1957, pp.211-212.

לדעת את עצמו ותכונותיו ותנאי קיומו על פי נסיונות העבר, ואז יהיה לעם חכם ונבון, היודע "מאין בא ולאן הוא הולך", והעבר והעתיד יתמזגו אז בקרב האני שלו. ... עת הזהב היא לחוקרי קדמוניות, למאסטי מגלות בלות וספרים עתיקים ולמבקרים ומפרשים ומפרשי-מפרשים "פ"א) " ... רק בעקב התבטלות הישות השפלה מפני הגבוהה עליה, נעשו דבריו ומעשיו והליכותיו לקנין הכלל כולו. "פ"ז)

He is also influenced by European languages in ending the period sentence with a long dash.

" הרב הנאור ר' מרדכי עליאשברג, אחד מראשי חו"צ, נאסף אל עמיו, וחו"צ בכל מקום שהם הספידוהו כהלכה : הללו קראו עצרות לבכי ולמספד בבתי כנסיות ובבתי מדרשות, הללו כתבו מאמרים מלאים קינה ונהי בכה"ע לישראל, ויש אשר אחזו בזה וגם מזה לא הניחו ידם, ויש גם אשר בחום לבם בקרבם אמרו לעשות לו שם עולם בישראל, אחדים יעצו ליטע לשמו דברים טובים שונים בחו"ל, ואחרים לא הסתפקו בזה ויתנדבו להקים את שמו על קולוניא שלמה בא"י; — הצד השווה שבהם, שכולם בכו רב בכי, עד כי לא היה בהם כוח לבכות עוד, וידמו... " (מ"א)

In his writings one realizes his method of emphasizing a word or a part of the sentence. To do that he would either put it between inverted commas or by writing it in open letters. He would use the same method for enclosing quoted words or those which are repeated.

The length of Ahad Ha-C<sup>a</sup>Am's sentence and unity of his essays made it impossible for him to avoid the excessive use of particles and conjunctions even at the beginning of his paragraphs.

Ahad Ha-C<sup>a</sup>Am was reluctant to use newly coined words

even if they were widely known to the reading public. An excellent example is the sub-title which he used for Ha-Shiloah: "מכתב-עתי", although the word "ירחון" which was coined by Klausner sometime before the foundation of Ha-Shiloah was already in use. On the other hand, whenever he felt a lack of words he used non-Hebrew vocabulary - sometimes unjustifiably - because a Hebrew alternative already existed. The following examples are taken from a single essay "תחית הרוח" (9) and each word is repeated several times:

קולטורא	(173)	פורמליסמוס	(174)	אמנציפציא	(176)
אידיאליסמוס	(177)	דיפלומאטי	(174)	אוביקטיבי	(175)
אסימילציא	(176)	ריאליסמוס	(177)	פרוגרמא	(174)
פילוסופים	(175)	ליברלים	(176)	הסטוריות	(178)
איקונומית	(174)	סובייקטיבי	(175)	פרגרס	(176)
אידיאל	(178)	ריפורמא	(178)	אורגני	(180)
אקציות	(182)	אטמוספירא	(184)	אורגניזטור	(186)
ריאקציא	(178)	ריקלמא	(180)	קונגורס	(183)
אורתודוכסיא	(184)	אימגרציא	(179)	אקדמיא	(181)
קומונסיא	(183)	קריטריון	(185)	ז'רגון	(179)
קולוניות	(181)	אנציקלופידיא	(183)	פאזיא	(180)
אורגניזציה	(182)	פטרונים	(184)	פזות דפלו- מטיות	(186)

Aḥad Ha-Cam expressed his thoughts by means of parallelism either by developing his argument in more than one way or by presenting the argument both for and against so that his reasoning was clear to the reader

(9) Kitvé A.H., p.173-186

and that his judgement would be accepted. This pattern dominates nearly all his essays.

"הללו דוחקים את הקץ ומאבדים כוחם בבנין שאין לו, יסוד והללו דוחים את הקץ ומאבדים כוחם בבנין שאין לו גבול," (עמ' ב) "בזאת-חשבתי אז - יבדל העתיד מן העבר, שעד כה פזרתי, ומעתה אכנס; עד כה היו מחשבותי ודברי קשורים תמיד בצרכי השעה, ומעתה אעזוב חיי שעה ואעסוק בחיי עולם; לא אוסיף עוד לבזבז חיי רוחי "פרורים פרורים", אלא אתכנס בתוך נפשי, אקבץ טעם רכושי הרוחני למקום אחד, ובסתר חזרי אעבוד את ספרותנו עבודה אחת שלמה וארוכה.... תחת אשר לפניי הייתי כותב לתיאבון, בשעה שרציתי ועל מה שרציתי, הריני עתה מחויב לכתוב בשעה שאחרים רוצים ועל מה שהם רוצים; " (עמ' קכ"ח)

Even the titles of most of his essays were formed in this way:

עבדות בתוך חירות, בין קודש לחול, מדת הדין ומדת הרחמים, לתולדות החיוב והשלילה, מוקדם ומאוחר בחיים, עבר ועתיד, כהן ונבי, צרך ויכולת, התורה והעבודה, סופרינו וקוראינו, דבור ושתיקה, תחיה ובריאה, יחיד ורבים, החסא ועונשו.

Sometimes he uses this method of comparison and contrast in a rhythmic and symmetric style which one can divide into equal units like poetry:

- 1- אם בהכניסה לתוכו בקולי קולות,
  - 2- דברים מרעישים ומלהיבים,
  - 3- רגשות וחפצים חדשים,
  - 4- המשנים את הבחירה גם למרות הידיעה
  - 5- או בהכניסה לתוכו לאט,
  - 6- בדברים של טעם ודעת,
  - 7- מושגים ומעשים חדשים,
  - 8- המשנים את הבחירה בהסכם עם הידיעה.
- ( עמ' קכ"ו )

This passage can be divided into two opposed parts which are almost equal in the number of words. The first part (1-4) is 17 words and the second (5-8) is 17. The parallel is as follows: 1:5, 2:6, 3:7, 4:8. The same analysis could be applied on the following passages:

- 1 יש שעושים עצמם כלא שומעים
- 2 ואינם משיבים כלום ,
- 3 ויש שעושים עצמם כלא מבינים
- 4 ומשיבים שלא ממין הטענה (עמ' שי"ג)
- 1 כשדציתי -
- 2 וזה היה יוצא מן הכלל -
- 3 נמצאתי לבעלי דיני ,
- 4 וכשדציתי -
- 5 וזה היה הכלל -
- 6 הייתי כלא שומע . (עמ' קכ"ט)

# APPENDIX I

"THE MISSION OF HA-SHILOAH", HA-SHILOAH i, 1896, pp.1-6

## THE MANIFESTO OF AHAD HA-CAM

By establishing this monthly periodical at the present time, we are providing what, it seems to us, the time requires and meeting a need of which many men are conscious.

We are not establishing a house of learning for scholars, in which they will sit and argue with each other and invent new innovations, in order to expand a theory or knowledge for its own sake; but we are aiming at the general body of the people. We want it to find in this periodical suitable spiritual nourishment and matters which it needs to know, in order to repair its breaches and to rebuild its ruins.

Once again "to repair and to rebuild"! What else is the rest of our literature doing now, if not repairing and rebuilding. The aim is the same, but the methods are different.

There are two ways through which literature can penetrate the mind of the people and affect the course of its life, either by bringing into its mind, with a blast of trumpets and in exciting, sensational words, new feelings and desires which will change the sense of choice unconsciously, or by bringing into its mind gradually, through words of taste and knowledge, new concepts and principles which will change the sense of choice consciously.

In the past, when Hebrew literature was a weapon in the struggle of the Haskalah, it moved in these two directions simultaneously. By using attractive means it tried to stimulate in the people a desire for "the light" and by using means which broadened knowledge, it tried to bring the light itself within its area. It was admittedly a dim light, which increased the thirst instead of quenching it but this was already enough for our literature at that time when its whole desire was only to make us appreciate the quality of the light, so that we could go and seek it at its sources.

Certainly we went, sought and found. The gates to universal knowledge were opened to us without obstacles, and all those who seek it will find it now easily without any longer requiring the mediation of Hebrew literature. This miserable Hebrew literature did not then find in the path of knowledge the suitable objective for its activity. What would be the point of gleaning for us shrivelled ears from field of another when we can enter the field without it and eat our fill? But also through the other path - to become a trumpet sounding incessantly in order to arouse the "sleepers" - it has still not been able to bring about any concrete

benefit, because the "sleepers" were already aroused without it, through the roar of life itself. Therefore it is almost certain that Hebrew literature would have ceased of its own also in the east as it had ceased previously in the west if there had not been born among us recently a new aspiration, for revival and inner development, which has given our literature too the right to live and to develop, not as before, in the shape of transition to another world, but as an actual part of our inner world.

Since there is no privilege without obligation, through this privilege - to be considered as an actual part of our inner world - an obligation has been imposed on our literature to teach us how to know this inner world: the course of development of our people in all periods, the ways of revealing its spirit in all branches of life, its spiritual and physical position in all countries at this time, and the open as well as the latent connections between all these and the phenomena that appear in the life of the surrounding nations and the rules which control the life of mankind and society in general. Only by revealing to the people what has taken place and is taking place and the real relation between it and the surrounding world, only then will it understand what it can still be and recognize its suitable place in the world, and only then will it be possible for it to find its way and reform its life fully. But our literature has not fulfilled this obligation so far, because the "new aspiration" has been aroused in fact at first not by "thinkers", but by the impressions of concrete actions which were engraved on our hearts without any medium, therefore there was a need which had been felt before - not to set it on a base of knowledge, but to strengthen those "impressions" which created it, so that it will be raised forthwith to a position of lively and fruitful power, and would not remain for a long time only in a state of barren sentiment. Therefore we see also subsidiary literature which went from the beginning of its activity only in one way by putting "a trumpet to its lips" in order to stir hearts and arouse slumbering forces.

Certainly one cannot deny that in that way the activity of literature has influenced the people whether to a small or great degree; but equally one cannot deny that while it was busy trying to arouse slumbering forces, thought has slumbered also in it and knowledge has been greatly impoverished, and if anyone was to decide to go down to the depth of our people's life, his attempts would be in vain if he sought help from our contemporary literature, because he would find almost nothing except superficial information and insubstantial judgements acquired by "transmission" without a true basis, and without analysis or clear recognition. It is not, therefore, surprising that many of us have finally begun to feel a kind of inner

"emptiness". The Jewish brain which had become accustomed to work cannot rest for long. We are tired of having our feelings stirred and aroused and we want also to know and to understand. The big question mark which has appeared on the surface of Judaism during the previous two generations and which disappeared afterwards in thick clouds, is reappearing gradually from within the fog. The fear of it is weakening the inebriety of our feelings and forcing us to observe with open eyes and clear minds all its details - what is our essential national or historical character for which or because of which we have fought against the whole world for thousands of years? What is our present life in all the lands to which we are scattered, to what extent is it really our life and in what does it need, and in what does it suffer, reform? Above all and in particular, the question of the future - whether, how and when shall we reach the longed-for "port" in spite of the violent "current" which is tearing us limb by limb and carrying them one by one to the "great sea"?

These general questions, each of which could be divided into a multitude of individual questions, are now gnawing the brains of every Jew who has brains in his skull. All those who cannot be content with a flimsy excuse or with a sensational phrase, who understand that it is impossible to solve our wonderful "riddles" while "standing on one leg" - all of them will complain about the absence of a monthly periodical in our literature. Only a monthly which is not under the pressure of time will have the power to penetrate gradually into the secret places of our life, to collect slowly "their keys" scattered in terms of time and place, to explain every phenomenon and every problem from all its different aspects and to bring us nearer to the desired end - to know ourselves, to understand our life and to establish our future wisely.

These are the thoughts that have aroused us to test our power to carry out this project. Can we really succeed in creating the required organ? This does not depend on us, but on our scholars and on our writers. We for our part will do everything in our power, will they do theirs?

We, therefore, do not think it is possible to give definite promises in advance concerning the character of the subjects which will appear in this periodical and we will content ourselves with proposing now in general terms only the headings of the aspects which we would like to publish in it.

a) Features of science, which will give correct concepts of various distinguished phenomena - religious, moral, social, literary, etc. - which are attributed to the life of the Jewish people and its spiritual development from ancient times till now. This general definition includes on one hand, many



features of general science (from the history of ancient nations, the history of culture, psychology, morals, education and the other "humane studies") insofar as they are concerned with Judaism and light up the darkness in various corners of our life and our history. On the other hand, this definition excludes certain enquiries which fall within the area of "Wisdom of Israel". (like minute examination of books and details of their author's life and so on) which do not add anything to the "knowledge of ourselves" and do not interest anyone except a small number of students of philology, bibliography etc. It is impossible to give an exact definition of these two categories. But for scholars - we hope to deal here only with them - there is no need for precise definition. When they have experience of the character of this periodical they will understand what material from each subject will suit it, and in what form.

b) "Publicistics" - articles dealing with the intellectual, moral, economic and political etc. situation of our people now in all countries, which would attempt to give sufficient explanation of all good and bad phenomena as they are, with the reasons for them and their consequences, and on the basis of this sort of explanation - to show as far as possible also methods for change and improvement. Subjects for such articles could be either a certain part of the people (country, city, community, society, faction etc.), or a certain branch of life (education, public institutions, source of livelihood, moral qualities etc.) in a certain place or in various places. However, in any case, our principal aim is to explain the situation of our inner life, while explaining the external attitude of other nations towards us - which is a favourite subject for our writers - will not be part of our work unless it is necessary for understanding the inner phenomena.

To my regret, it is necessary to add here - what should have been self-evident - that not every "eloquent person" is capable of writing "articles", because publicistics which is at one and the same time a science and a profession, requires from those who practise it - not less (or even more) than scientific literature - wide general knowledge, literary talent and taste, and needless to say, a wide knowledge of the details of the subject of each article and the scientific elements which are related to it.

c) Criticism. This title is mostly used by us only in its narrow sense - reviewing new books; but our own aim will lead to widening this meaning to its true extent - judging the human spirit and the result of human work in relation to the truth (logical criticism) to goodness (moral criticism) and to beauty (aesthetic criticism). Criticism in this sense will cover not only

new books, but also all ideas and actions, new as well as old, which made or are making or can make an impression on the life of the people and the course of its spiritual development and which therefore should and must be examined from the three aspects mentioned, either from all simultaneously or from one or two aspects, all according to the subject. Nevertheless books are specially suited for general criticism, because they often give it the chance to judge many ideas and actions together and to show the connection between them as well as their common principles. We shall accept willingly critical articles of this kind, provided that - regretfully we have to add here too what should have been self-evident - provided that they will be effective not only in their sarcasm and mockery but also by really going into the depth of each subject and casting some light on its totality and its details through knowledge and good taste, in a style which suits each subject, according to its character and its essential or historical value.

d) "Belles lettres". By implementing the phenomena of life, its problems and its customs, in beautiful and concrete forms, lyrical works have strong influence on the majority of human beings and is capable of engraving all this on their hearts and of rousing them to thoughts and observation far more than the discussion of abstract theoretical argument. Good stories from the past and present life of our people, which give a faithful picture of our position in various periods and places, or admit a ray of light on some dark corner of our "inner world", will be of great benefit for stimulating thoughts and widening in us the scope of our national knowledge and consequently they will suit our objective no less than the theoretical categories mentioned above. However, beautiful works which offer nothing more than their beauty, which stimulate emotional feelings only for pleasure, have also their place and their value in a certain aspect of human life; but in our present situation, we think that our feeble literature should not disperse its small resources on such matters, while more necessary and useful matters require investigation and there are no resources. For this reason it is possible that the number of poems will be small in this periodical, because most of our contemporary poets do not follow in the footsteps of Y.L. Gordon, by combining poetry with thoughts on our life and our numerous requirements. Mere poetry, lyrical effusions on the beauty of nature and the delights of love and so forth - our youth can seek from other languages where they will find enough.

If we add to these categories some other periodical reviews on the new phenomena in life and literature, then we have the programme of this periodical as we had it in mind; but as we have said, we depend on our

scholars and on our writers in carrying out our plane in its pure and perfect form. Our scholars should be so kind as to act like the well-bred fellow scholars from other nations who consider it their duty to come out of their seclusion from time to time and speak to the people in a clear language on any important matter which could be necessary and useful for the public. While Jewish scholars are mostly tightly closed behind the walls of their houses of learning, each one trying to discover only secrets in his own private branch, without remembering or paying attention to the people and its requirements. Our writers, that is to say those of them who are really equipped in every respect for a considerable literary work, should stop justifying themselves (as they have been doing for a long time) by saying that their work is little and poor because of the absence of a special "literary centre" reserved for writers of knowledge and taste, in which they can say what they have to say far from the noise and tumult of everyday life. Here we offer them a "literary centre" which seeks to attract only writers of knowledge and taste. Any one who wants, and has the knowledge and the talent required for this work - should come and work with us as he desires and thinks fit.

Indeed, "as he desires and thinks fit", because without any favouritism, Ha-Shiloah will always give place to words which are said with knowledge and sincerity, but not for the sake of provocation. It is true that nowadays people are in the habit of thinking that any periodical is obliged to introduce, from the time of its establishment, a complete doctrine, prepared answers for all the principal questions and that everything published in it should be in accordance with this "editorial" doctrine. But apart from this being impossible in a Hebrew periodical, for this simple reason that no faction has enough suitable literary talents which would enable it to be "self-sufficient" without having to seek help from other writers - apart from this, one should still consider whether this European practice is proper and based on concrete logic and suitable for the demands of truth and justice. After all, the "editorial board" is only an abstract name under which is hidden the editor who is simply a human being, a person of great or little education, but not free of error like any human being, and if he is a wise man he must admit that his opinion is not more decisive than that of people who are no less logical and knowledgeable than he. His duty, it is true, is to maintain good taste and knowledge, and to keep away anything which is opposed to laws of morality and good manners, and to give the organ which he edits a general spirit concerning its form and the quality of its interests in such a way as to make it really a kind of "organic" creation and not a pedlar's bakset with all kinds of goods in it. But this does not give him the right to lock the door

against anyone who may come to say in public words which ought to be heard, even if they are opposed to the "views of the editorial board," which are no more than views of an individual or individuals. If the latter - the editor and his assistants - have different views and are able to prove their truth by means of evidence, they should strip off their official robe and say what they have to say as private persons like all other writers, and the public will decide which is the more reasonable. The practice of speaking in the name of editorial board and making it a supreme judge of every subject as if there is nothing unknown to it - this practice has been devised only to frighten the public and will bring no advantage in the search for truth.

Whether this way will satisfy our readers or not - in any case it is better that they should know in advance that it will be the way of Ha-Shiloah so that it may be judged in these circumstances according to its way.

## APPENDIX II

### "OUR OBJECTIVE": A WORD FROM THE NEW EDITOR THE MANIFESTO OF J. KLAUSNER (HA-SHILOAH xi, pp.1-11)

The reading public must have noticed, from the special prospectus which has been sent to all the subscribers of Ha-Shiloah, together with the November issue and which was also published in various periodicals, that this monthly has been transferred from one editorship to another. In that prospectus it was said that Ha-Shiloah is to retain the general character which characterized it until now, nevertheless there will be important changes which have been detailed in a few words in the prospectus. These words require an explanation.

There were two basic policies which marked the general character of Ha-Shiloah under the previous editorship, and distinguished it from all other Hebrew periodicals; its continuous struggle against traditional opinions which were no more than "approved lies" and its concept of events in Jewish life from a historical point of view.

It is easy to decide that "it is necessary to swim against the current", but how difficult it is to struggle actively against the dominant spirit in a certain period. This dominant spirit surrounds you and encircles you on every side, it controls you. whether you are aware of it or not, it unites you with all your acquaintances and friends, it also penetrates even into the environment in which you live, and into the air which you breathe. This dominant spirit is the summary of all the opinions which are considered by "everyone" as true, and which "everyone" is ready to protect, to defend and to fight for. To swim against the current, and to open war against the dominant and traditional ideas - means in fact that you have to fight against the powerful and dreadful beast which is crushing everything, namely "public opinion". What is more difficult is that you will be struggling against yourself, that is to say, with that part of your individuality which has been absorbed by the environment without your realizing it....

Nevertheless, Ha-Shiloah has swum against the current and fought strongly and courageously against all the "approved lies". There was no subsidiary consideration which could have tipped its just and its precise scales, even a consideration which had come from a pure source - for example, it is not good to cause pain to the hearts of people who are immersed in one false idea or another. Ha-Shiloah has preached

fearlessly and without weariness only for what it believed to be right and true - without taking into consideration at all, what the people might say or how they will treat it. Ha-Shiloah did not employ tricks in order to please the majority, but its aim has always been to raise the majority towards it to lift up the spirit of a generation which is being educated through Hebrew literature, and to plant in the heart of this generation loftier moral demands as well as more respectable literary manners. How far it succeeded - this is not the place to explain, but that it had this aim and acted with considerable energy towards our reading public, this I believe no-one can deny. But Ha-Shiloah under the previous editorship has done even better than that.

It is easy to fight enemies even if they are more numerous and stronger than you. In a war like this you will feel that a complete faction is behind you to support you with all its strength. You remain within your circle, among your allies, upon whose views you have been brought up and educated, and whose wars you are fighting - their wars which are also your wars. But how difficult and how sad it is if you have to fight against friends. In such circumstances you will be deserted and all will be against you. You will be forced to cut yourself off from the circle to which you are accustomed, to direct poisoned arrows against people who are close to you spiritually, to see with disappointment how your friends consider you as an enemy who has betrayed his own principles, and, what is worse, you will always be afraid that your words might be used as a dangerous weapon by your real enemies, who might use them against the idea of which you criticize only the casual deficiencies, or only try to reveal the deficiencies of its leadership, while the essential idea of that movement is still loved and dear to you. This last fear is the most difficult of all. Many upright people see vanity in the idea which they love and in the wrong doing of the faction which carries its flag - and they are silent, declaring: "Tell it not in Gath". So the idea grows gradually weaker because of the lack of honest and open criticism. Ha-Shiloah

was the only Jewish periodical which has not been restrained, even by consideration arising sometimes from a heart full of love, from continuing its strong and sharp criticism directed also against friends - against the leadership of a movement which was as high and eternal as the stars. This movement was the most important principle and "the spiritual centre" for many of the assistants of Ha-Shiloah. Every time a

disgraceful incident took place in our life or in our literature Liberum veto (I forbid), a protest from aching hearts was to be found in Ha-Shiloah.

Yet there was a great virtue in the criticism of Ha-Shiloah. It paid respect to any real movement which has a foundation in life and literature. It has never treated an important idea disrespectfully even if it did not agree with it. In such a case Ha-Shiloah would fight strongly against the idea but in a respectful manner. The proverb: "In an emergency the matter is different," or as the French say: "a la guerre comme a la guerre", was not in the nature of Ha-Shiloah.

Severe words were published in it against any new movement which was undesirable from the point of view of its contributors, but it did not permit itself to publish light words, mockery or contempt, or "denial of existence" in dealing with any important movement or any worthy idea. This was the attitude of Ha-Shiloah towards Herzlian Zionism and also towards the young writers and the radical demands which they expressed in the early years of Ha-Shiloah.

This leads us to the second fundamental point which characterized Ha-Shiloah in the previous period. It is possible to observe the events of life from two different viewpoints: the point of view of the moment and the point of view of history.

It is possible to treat any event only as it looks at the present time; then it is obviously an isolated incident whether it is a small or a great moment in the life of a nation or that of mankind. This is the way of ordinary people in observing current events, and also the way of newspapers whose mission is to deal with daily and temporary events. But there is a higher viewpoint. This is the historical viewpoint which is close in its quality to the view which has been expressed by Spinoza in his acute words: *sub specie seternitatis* (from the viewpoint of eternity). According to this viewpoint no event can be judged separately but rather as a small link in a big chain which is being extended without end, and of which each link is based on the past and influences the future. Each single event can then be described as the poet said:

A single thread in the net of all eternal powers,  
embroidering openly and weaving secretly  
the riddle of life will never be solved.

Those who observe events from this viewpoint are twisting the single thread - the solitary event - with the great yarn which has been spun throughout the long history of the nation and which should be spun further in the near future. Only then will it be easy for them to see if the new event has really happened because of deep causes for it in the life of the nation, past and present, and whether this event

will be of any value in the future - or whether the causes are not very deep (no event can occur without some causes) and the new event is nothing but a "storm in a teacup".

Ha-Shiloah has always observed all events from the historical point of view. This approach has had two-fold effects: first, Ha-Shiloah has maintained its high standard as a monthly which should treat important issues not as a daily newspaper which is here today and in the dustbin tomorrow. Secondly, it saved Ha-Shiloah from the danger of despising any idea which may not seem to be great in its beginning although its future might thrive greatly. When Ha-Shiloah found deep causes which impressed their stamp on the history of the Jewish people or on its present life in any new phenomenon in our life, it paid special attention to it even if this phenomenon was completely against the spirit of Ha-Shiloah.

The historical point of view has also protected Ha-Shiloah from a greater danger. In recent times the point of view which holds that "the new is forbidden by the law" has made room for a point of view which is no less harmful. It is obvious, in the opinion of many people, especially in the opinion of the young generation, among the Jews and among the nations that the new should overcome the old. Therefore it is enough for something to be new in order to be welcomed by thousands even if there is nothing in it except its newness. That is how "trends" are created, which are not therefore any different from what has existed so far except that they are new. Here too our historical point of view could save us from the danger of being carried away by new trends which are worse than the old. History tells us of innumerable new systems that have created an uproar and tumult for some time and afterwards have calmed down without leaving any substantial impression, so that the historian mentions them in no more than two or three short lines. It is enough to mention the Gnostics in the first centuries of the Christian era on the one hand, and the agitators and revolutionaries in the eighteenth century on the other. Gnosticism created an uproar in the entire civilized world - Jewish and Christian - for more than two hundred years; but what remains of it in life and literature? The roar and storm of the "sturm und drang" period continued for twenty-five years, but what has it left for us despite the fact that it is very close to our own time? Who now knows its "geniuses" who have created such uproar in their world? Who now reads their strange books which are full of unparalleled adoration of personality and of the demand to be freed from all the practices of society, even



those that are most natural and just? It was the historical point of view which helped Ha-Shiloah to deal with, for example, the demands of Berdyczewski and to separate the wheat from the chaff, that is to say, to separate justifiable demands based on historical causes and on the conditions of our present life from the peculiar and contradictory demands which he gained from non-Jewish sources. But at the same time Ha-Shiloah has never forgotten the possibility that after twenty years the fate of the distorted "Nietzscheanism" about which some of our young writers are enthusiastic at present could be the same fate of all "storms in a teacup", on which the historian passes in two or three lines...

In our opinion this was the main characteristic of Ha-Shiloah in the past and this characteristic will remain in the future. Also in the future Ha-Shiloah will continue to fight not only against enemies but also against friends if they act or speak in an unworthy manner. Ha-Shiloah would like to remain as it has been - the inner consciousness of the Jews. When an individual commits an unworthy action he feels remorse, and sincere writers must arouse the same remorse in the hearts of their readers and in the hearts of the whole nation. Ha-Shiloah wants to be a free platform for writers of this kind. There will be no place in it for favouritism for any faction, it will not be fearful of the opinion of the majority and it will not be dominated by subsidiary motives - even those which are motivated by compassion and blind love. Zionism will still have priority in it but precisely for this reason the attitude of Ha-Shiloah towards Zionism will be sharply critical: "Whom he loveth he correcteth." The one and essential liberty which a writer who belongs to the Zionist organisation has is the liberty to criticize. Particular attention will be paid to the aspiration of the "younger generation" who cannot be satisfied with the present situation of the Jewish people and who demands fundamental changes in its life and literature; but we must not forget that there is much chaff in this wheat, and that there is much nonsense in the bright dreams of our younger generation. In dealing with these aspirations we shall not seek to compromise or to mediate between extremes but it is the truth that we shall seek; even where falsehood would be more attractive in its extremism and more glittering in its apparent perfection, we shall, nevertheless, give priority to the bare truth over ornamented and glistening falsehood.

This will be the general character of the new Ha-Shiloah. In all these matters we want to follow in the footsteps of the previous Ha-Shiloah and we shall

hold to its course in general, though obviously not in all details.

However, the new Ha-Shiloah will also differ from the previous one in many essential matters. It is impossible to deny that Hebrew literature has progressed and developed during the last fifteen years. But this progress is not very great. Even now we still lack great creative writers whose creative work would be able to educate a whole generation with new concepts and to fill the emptiness in its heart. Jewish Science has not yet been produced in Hebrew. We have only two or three publicists worthy of the name, we have not got even one critic who could reach a high philosophical standard and become a creative writer in commenting on the creative works of others. It is difficult to point in this generation to even five Hebrew writers whose works will survive for future generations.

What is the reason for this? In our opinion one must seek this basic reason - among other reasons which have also contributed much - in the division in our literature between Jewish affairs and general human affairs.

Why should we deceive ourselves? The Exile is to blame, but the fact exists. A French writer who knows no language but his mother-tongue could become a writer in the full sense of the word; he could become even a Zola; while a Hebrew writer in our time (in the distant past this was not the case) who does not know any language but Hebrew could be nothing more than an idler. We have sharp brains among our Yeshivah students, and great talents among the authors of books of Talmudic arguments and sermons, but they lack only one thing - European culture, and therefore they remain good for nothing and their books have no value. On the other hand, those Hebrew writers who have acquired general culture are accustomed to look upon everything that they have read in other languages as having nothing to do with their Jewish culture and with our national literature. From this there is one of two results: either they will distinguish completely between what they have read in other languages and what they write in Hebrew, and then they remain completely useless in their Hebrew works. (of this kind are the western scholars who write occasionally in Hebrew, and also most of the old school of them who do research and write articles in Russia). Those who think that all the strange phraseology and the out-of-date expressions which they would not allow themselves to use in non-Hebrew articles, are good and even indispensable, when they write in Hebrew. Or else they introduce to Hebrew literature what they have read in foreign languages, as it is, without adapting it to the requirements of Hebrew spirit and language. Then they remain imitators like monkeys, writers who have spoiled their natural personality and another alien personality, which they are not capable yet of adapting it.

For this reason our literature has "fallen between two stools", it has no writers with a full and healthy spirit in whom Hebrew culture and European culture have been united to provide the foundation of a natural personality, without having to be idlers immersed in the studies of the Middle Ages on the one hand and without feeling a "split" in their hearts on the other. When there is no spiritual wholeness there is no room for great talents.

There is another point. When we force a Hebrew writer to discuss only what affects Jewishness we are restraining at least one part of his mind. A Jew does not occupy himself with his Jewishness all the time, and he remains always a human being. The human feelings and thoughts of a Hebrew writer - whether he is a poet or a philosopher - always force their way to the heart and brain, and they do not always take a recognisable Jewish garb - Solomon Ibn Gabirol, Judah Ha-Levi, Abraham Ibn Ezra and others like them were certainly Hebrew poets and philosophers with all their soul; nevertheless their divans include poems on wine, nature and women in which a Jewish form is not more distinctive than a French form in the poems of Berenger on similar themes. Therefore if we say to Hebrew poets for example that "mere poetry, lyrical effusion on the beauty of nature the delights of love etc. - our youth can seek in the languages of other nations and they will find their fill of it" (The Mission, Ha-Shiloah i, 5), we then force them to be unnatural by suppressing and subduing many sincere human thoughts and feelings which they really think and feel but for which they find no place in Hebrew literature. A Hebrew writer cannot, therefore, be complete in his spirit, and in the absence of this completeness it is not possible for great talents to develop.

There is no device or tactic to overcome this obstacle but to remove completely the barrier which separates "Jewish" aspects from "general" aspects. That is what we intend to do in the new Ha-Shiloah. When a Jewish youth reads from his childhood about Jewish affairs and general human affairs in the same language and the same book, all these affairs will be intermixed in his heart to form a complete and unified view of the world, and they will no longer be regarded by him as belonging to two separate worlds which are not related to each other. Then he will introduce to his general culture the Hebrew spirit stamped on him since his birth and inherited through thousands of generations. And part of his Jewish culture, a part that is not separated, will be the general phenomena and ideas which he will have read in his national language, and so they will have become "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh". We are not chauvinists but nationalists, and our nationalism is based on the lofty idea that all the nations should

accept every truth, everything that is good and valuable from one another and should hand on all that is true, good and valuable which they create themselves. Only a broad Hebrew literature which can absorb all truth, all that is good and valuable that is in the literatures of all other nations, will be capable in the near or distant future, of influencing those nations themselves. We do not consider ourselves inferior to the Norwegians.

It is true that here one might see room for the "imitation of wasting time" while our aspiration is for "imitation of competition", but it makes no difference to us whether a Hebrew writer imitates the general books of Nietzsche or Brandys or those of Hommel and Schurer which are concerned with Judaism. Both are imitations which will not produce an original literature and one must be very careful of all of them.

We would like to make another change which is not so fundamental, in Ha-Shiloah: we want to enlarge the section of belles lettres in it (obviously this will include poetry). We are not doing this, as others may imagine, solely to attract ordinary readers to Ha-Shiloah although there would also be nothing wrong in that; Ha-Shiloah is not designed for specialist scholars and we are, therefore, entitled to aspire and to attempt to make it popular among a larger and wider reading public. But we would not have been encouraged to enlarge the section of belles lettres for this reason only, were it not for a worthier reason. We consider that poetical works have enormous spiritual power whose influence on the development of the Jewish people should gradually increase. One of the greatest errors of our intelligentsia in Germany and our scholars and publicists in Russia was that they did not appreciate the great value of belles lettres, and almost looked down on it and its writers. Among the nations a philosopher like Kant was not ashamed to deal with belles lettres and to talk enthusiastically about poems by Wehland in a deep, philosophical book. Even in our day the best books on Goethe are written precisely by the most excellent German philosophers of the present time: Kuno Fischer, Wendelband and Paulson. A philosopher like Simmel has written a long article on the new poet Stephen George and nobody has seen anything strange in this. On the other hand just try to ask one of our scholars in Germany or in Russia to write an article on Bialik - he would look at you as if you were insane. The reason for this attitude is hidden very deep in the life and views of the Jew. The Jew is immersed always in only two things - his religion and his living, and he can hardly understand that it should be possible for a person to be engaged in research that is to say, in philosophy and Jewish science - after all, the Talmud is also philosophy, and it is full of sharp logical terminology, while writing poems in his opinion is nothing but

entertainment and that explains the fact that among us there are too many rhymesters - and very few poets. However, stories, novels and plays performed on the stage are all considered by the Jew as playthings, amusement and frivolity in which "Gentiles" spend their time to no purpose. Is it possible for intelligent people to care for such empty things? The Jew is not yet able to get used to the view that all poetical works are an important possession of human culture, and great national values without which no nation deserves the name of nation. Almost all our great writers in the Spanish period - Yudah Ha-Levi, Solomon Ibn Gabiral, Abraham Ibn Ezra - were philosophers and poets at the same time. Now the Jew cannot understand how possible it is for a grown and busy man, who is neither a "youth" near to puberty, nor a "young man" living with his father-in-law, to read stories and poems. If someone would tell this Jew that the philosopher Artur Schopenhauer was expert in all the poems and books of Goethe, and knew them almost by heart, and was always reading the plays of Shakespeare and Calderon - he would consider this as remarkable and certainly as nonsense too.

We are ready to fight this mistaken view. We want to accustom Hebrew readers gradually to treat belles lettres as an important part of national and human culture so that they should not be considered by them only as an amusement and playthings any more. The Spanish period accustomed our people to philosophy. This was a new national possession. The present period should accustom our people to belles lettres and art; and these will be among the national values which we produced during the last century. For this reason we have decided to give the reader two quires full of poems and stories every month. If we succeed in publishing material of real beauty, free from any partisan propensities or tenderness, without much sentimentality and "sweetness", without deep psychological analysis and without scratching and pecking at counterfeit feelings - only then we hope to come gradually closer to this great and important aim - to plant in the hearts of our readers deeper awareness that beauty, like thoughts and ethics, has a great personal value and that, therefore, beautiful poetical works are not only "blossoms" but also "fruits."

We also want to give in Ha-Shiloah one or two feuilletons every month. A few years ago Mr. Taw<sup>er</sup> wrote a feuilleton entitled: "Why do I write feuilletons?" In it he explained that he is doing so for fear that the Jews might forget how to laugh, "gently, cup of sorrow relax a little." All that we, the Jews, see in our every-day life fills us with fearful and desperate sorrow, while the literature comes to chastise and rebuke, that is to say, adding to our sorrow and leading us to despair with its oppressive pictures of the terrible material and spiritual life of the Jewish

people. It has reached such a degree that we cannot feel our troubles any more, and we are not horrified any more when we read of things that grieve our hearts. The cup of sorrow is full and overflowing - and when someone suffers afflictions too frequently, his senses become feeble and dull, and he gets into a state of anaesthesia (lack of feeling). We must fear this most terrible situation. Dante set those who feel no anxiety (*in noncuranti*) in the vestibule of hell... but we shall reach a terrible situation even worse than that: on the one hand we shall not be able to cry any more and on the other hand we shall forget that there are people in this world whose mouth is filled with laughter. Alas for the man who is no longer capable of laughing - he has already passed and gone from this world...

We take the prophets as our model. We always exalt and glorify - rightly - their strong and courageous morals which brought punishment in the hearts of mankind and raised the people to repentance. But we also forget one small thing: the consolation in the words of the prophets are no less than their rebukes. The great seers gave the people to drink not only from the "cup of sorrow" but also from the cup of consolation, and the quality of kindness was greater than the quality of retribution. We do not have consolers like those now, and people find in their literature the same sorrow and the same bitterness which they always find in life. Perhaps this is why the Jew likes a humorous joke and in this he goes even to extremes: he likes coarse jokes and humorous trifles too, and there are good writers who supply his needs... It is obvious that there could be no place for cheap jokes in Ha-Shiloah. On the other hand, a light and good feuilleton, which is a kind of nice humoresque that discusses all topical matters with apparent superficiality in which are concealed deep ideas, a feuilleton which arouses laughter from tears and tears from laughter - a feuilleton of this kind could and should find a place also in a worthy monthly. We shall do our best to publish feuilletons of that type more frequently than the previous Ha-Shiloah used to do.

On the sections of publicistics and criticism we shall not say much. Here we shall not change anything. We shall follow in the footsteps of the previous Ha-Shiloah except that we hope to be able to publish

publicistic and critical articles more frequently, on both Jewish and general matters. We do not want to give simply articles which could only enrich the table of contents, but we want to raise questions which should require solutions. Any article which involves some new "problem" that troubles a writer searching for the truth, will be accepted willingly in Ha-Shiloah even if the solution of this problem is not found in

that article. It is only by presenting new problems that impoverished Jewish thought will be enriched, and a new life will be introduced to our literature; lately it has become rusty because almost all the articles which appear in it now are "worthless" and old in their contents and in their style.

We now have to say a few words on the section on science and research in the new Ha-Shiloah. All the aspects of literature which we have discussed so far are intended for a wide range of the reading public. Even the ordinary reader who is not used to delve deeply into abstract matters, will be able to read in Ha-Shiloah the stories and poems which will cover a large space in it, the publicistic and critical articles and the feuilletons which will be published in it from time to time. But we want to accustom the Hebrew reader to the simple idea - that he is not obliged to read everything. The European reader has already been accustomed to this: he knows that when he receives an issue of some monthly he will read in it matters with which he is familiar and he leaves the rest to others who are familiar with other matters and are not attracted by the material which interests him. This is not the case with Hebrew readers. They are in the habit of reading all the monthly from beginning to end or - as most of our Jewish brothers are accustomed to do - from end to beginning. And when they find two or three subjects out of a dozen in one issue in which some of the readers are not expert and do not understand them as well as they should, they grumble and complain against the monthly which is giving room for "nonsense" or - "academic subjects". Readers of this sort do an injustice to the organ to which they subscribe. They forget that it has devoted five complete quires to them, and therefore it is allowed to devote at least one quire to readers of a different sort, those who read deeply, who require more delicate spiritual nourishment. Let us not forget that we have no special monthly for scholars, and that it is not even possible to have such a monthly while our literature is in its present state. For this reason we think it is possible and necessary to devote a complete quire in each issue - the sixth part of Ha-Shiloah to scientific and philosophical subjects whose readers are indeed few in number but these "few" are in a certain way more important than the "many" who read only light and superficial material. These scientific and philosophical subjects will not be very popular, because regretfully we realize that the popular science which the Jewish writers give to their readers is mostly too deep for the ordinary reader and too superficial for the scholar. We shall publish as much as we can find of real science and philosophy, not what is actually known by these names in our literature.

On the other hand, we shall try to make sure that articles of this kind are comprehensive and extensive, that is to say they will deal not with an isolated scientific or historical item but a complete phenomenon of Jewish, or general history, of Jewish or general science. In the scientific section we shall try to give articles on the great philosophers and their systems, and in the historical section - monographs on the original periods of our history - on the period of the First Temple with reference to the new excavations in the antiquities of the Assyrians, the Egyptians and the Tyrians, on the period of the Second Temple with reference to the large number of religious, historical and philosophical books which were written by Jews during that time and were preserved in Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic. A monthly like Ha-Shiloah must aspire, above all, for original

Hebrew creative work to increase and develop. There is nothing which might help in the development of an original creativity more than spreading general philosophy among writers, because through this their general culture will be wide and deep, their logic will be more sensitive and elevated and their works will automatically be deeper and more perfect. Since original Hebrew creativity at the present time can be based only on the foundation of the past, therefore its development and perfection will benefit a great deal from more complete knowledge of the history of the most original and most fruitful periods of Jewish history. In the period of the First Temple were active prophets who were great lights for the whole world, and in the period of the Second Temple there was, on the one hand, the development of Christianity which afterwards dominated the entire ancient world, and on the other hand, there began to be formed the Talmud, that enormous structure - after all it was only this that made the Jews an eternal people.

These are the changes and expansions which we would like to make in Ha-Shiloah. Shall we be able to make Ha-Shiloah what we would like? This depends only on Hebrew writers. We call upon all writers who do not write only for the sake of writing or for the sake of material benefit: come and work with us! Our aim is clear - anyone who can help in carrying out this kind of programme - Ha-Shiloah is ready for him!

We know that the new mission of Ha-Shiloah will not please all writers and readers, but our comfort is that it is not possible and not necessary to please everyone. We cannot make Ha-Shiloah a "public domain" or a "place which is neither public nor private", but also it will never be a "private property"; it will be at the disposal of truth, the truth as we understand the term. If someone comes and from his words it is



evident that he is indeed searching for the truth, and believes that he can find it by different means, in a different place, then we shall give room in Ha-Shiloah for his truth, but we shall declare in clear and unambiguous words that this truth is his, while ours is different. We believe that this "freedom of expression" could satisfy even the writers whose views are very remote from ours - provided only that he is searching for the truth.

We have only one request from all the readers of Ha-Shiloah: if they saw in the first issues that the programme which is detailed in this article is still not carried out to the full, they should not forget that "all beginnings are difficult", that Hebrew writers who deserve this title are torn particularly in these days into twelve divisions and that our periodical literature is now in a state of ferment. Let the storm abate, let the winds be calm and let the camps be chosen - then we shall slowly try to fulfil all our promises. We hope and we believe that this effort of ours will not be in vain. This hope and this belief are the foundation for the existence of the renewed Ha-Shiloah.

# APPENDIX III

## RANGE OF SUBJECT MATTERS COVERED BY HA-SHILOAH (1896-1919)\*

Subject headings	Number of Articles**
Poetry	359
Feuilletons	3
Drama	23
Stories and novels	246
Jewish and general philosophy	70
Bible	35
Apocryphal books	9
Religion (other than Judaism)	1
Messianism	1
Philo-Judaism and Anti-Judaism	7
Sects, Parties and Trends in Judaism	31
Jewish and general folklore	18
The Wisdom of Israel	3
Talmud and Halakhah	51
Jewish and general sociology	14
Education and <i>Haskalah</i>	41
Philology	37
Jewish Chronology	1
Jewish art	1
Mediaeval poetry	8
Criticism and bibliography***	237
General history	3
Jewish history	45
Journalism and Zionism	177
Personalities (biographies)	126
Reminiscences	29
Middle East	5
Palestine	54
Miscellaneous	32

\*) Adapted from Barzilai: Ha-Shiloah 1896-1927, Bibliography, 1964

\*\*) Articles and works which appeared in instalments are considered as one entry.

\*\*\*) All critical articles on a certain writer are considered as one entry.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## (a) English

- Davidson, Israel  
The Genesis of Hebrew periodical literature,  
 Baltimore, 1900.
- Dubnow, S.M.  
History of the Jews in Russia and Poland;  
Translated from Russian by I. Friedlaender,  
 N.Y., 1975.
- Greenberg, L.  
The Jews in Russia; edited by M. Wischnitzer,  
 N.Y., 1967.
- Klausner, J.  
A History of Modern Hebrew Literature;  
 London, 1932.
- Kling, S.  
Joseph Klausner, N.Y. 1970.
- Pelli, M.  
The Age of Hashkalah, Leiden, 1979.
- Raisin, J.S.  
The Hashkalah Movement in Russia, Philadelphia, 1913.
- Simon, L. (Aryeh)  
Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, A Biography, London, 1960.
- "  
Ahad Ha-<sup>c</sup>Am, Essays, Letters, Memoirs Oxford, 1964.
- Spiegel, S.  
Hebrew Reborn, London, 1931.
- Waldstein, A.S.  
The Evolution of Modern Hebrew Literature(1850-1912)  
 N.Y., 1916.
- Waxman, M.  
A History of Jewish Literature, (vols. III-IV),  
 N.Y., 1960.

(b) Hebrew

אונגרפלד נ.

- ביאליק וסופרי צורו, תל-אביב, 1974.  
 " אגרות אלכסנדר צורבויים עורך המליץ "  
 העבר ב (1954) עמ' 145-156, ג (1955) עמ' 152-159,  
 " אגרות י.ל. קנטור לד. פרישמן, "העבר ד (1956)  
 עמ' 136-150.

אחד העם,

כל כתבי אחד העם, ירושלים, 1965.			
אגרות אחד העם, תל-אביב, 1956.			
ארכיון אחד העם, unpublished			
תיק מספר	38	א-ג	(אחיאסף)
"	833		(י. ציטלין)
"	<del>885</del>		(י. לנדא)
"	868	א-ב	(י. קלוזנר)
"	926		(י. ח. רובינצקי)
"	1016		(השלוח)

אליקשי ג..

- " הדור בעריכת ד. פרישמן, "  
 גליונות כו (1951-1952) עמ' 363-370.  
 " העתונות העברית בולגה במאה ה-19, "  
 העבר יג (1966) עמ' 59-97, יד (1967) עמ' 105-151.

בן-אבליגדור,

" אחד העם ובני משה, "נתיבות א (ורשה 1913) עמ' 238-290

בן-ישעי א.ז..

- " 120 שנה לעתונות העברית ברוסיה : 1841-1961, "  
 ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1962, עמ' 157-178.

בקר י. ; תורן ח..

- יוסף קלוזנר האיש ופועלו, תל-אביב, 1947.

ברזילי י. (פולמן),

- השלוח תרנ"ז-תרפ"ז ביבליוגרפיה, תל-אביב, 1964.

בריינין ר..

- פוזן בן-משה סמולנסקין חייו וספריו, ורשה 1914.

ברנפלד ש..

- " הספרות העתית בלשון עברית, "השלוח יז (1907) עמ' 298-304

גורברין נ..

- העומר ועורכו ש. בן-ציון, (עבודת דוקטור), תל-אביב 1972  
 (unpublished)

גרטהלף י. (עורך),

- עתונות יהודית שהיתה, תל-אביב, 1973.

גולן א..

- " אחד העם והספרות היפה, " על המשמר, 22.6.1977, עמ' 6.  
 " המדיניות הספרותית בעתון היומי הצפה ורשה 1903-1905  
 מאזנים טו (1977-1978) עמ' 42-49, 215-223, 275-284, 297.

גרינברום י..

- " איך נעלמה העתונות העברית היומית ברוסיה ובפולין, "  
 ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1962, עמ' 206-210.  
 " כתבי עתנו, " (השקפה כללית), השלוח יג (1904),  
 עמ' 180-189, 368-375; לד (1918) עמ' 86-92.

- המפל מ.,  
" אחד העם כעורך השלוח (35 שנה למותו )",  
הפועל הצעיר, 16.1, 1962.
- רבר ג.,  
" השפעתו של אחד העם ", התורן (1925), חוברת ז, עמ' 5-10.
- רילנאי ש. (ורסט),  
" הספרות העברית באספקלריה של השחר ",  
גליונות כו (1951-1952), עמ' 353-358.
- זיידמן י.א.,  
" שרשורים לסגנונו של אחד העם ",  
לשוננו ח (1937), עמ' 279-296; ט (1938), עמ' 31-43.
- טורוב נ.,  
" חבלי עריכה ", הדואר (1944), עמ' 516-519.
- טשרנוביץ ש.,  
" אחד העם העורך ", מוסף דבר, גליון מספר 18,41 אב 1926.
- יוטר א.י.,  
" הפולמוס בין אחד העם וברדיצ'בסקי ",  
הדואר (1976) עמ' 282-283.
- כ"ץ, בן-ציון,  
" 70 שנה לצאת העתון העברי היומי הראשון ",  
העבר ד (1956) עמ' 133-135.  
" יובל העתונות העברית היומית המחודשת ",  
העבר ב (1954) עמ' 5-22.  
" לתולדות הצנזורה של הספרות הישראלית ",  
התורן, שנה ט, חוברת י.
- לחבר פ.,  
ביאליק חייו ופועליו, תל-אביב, 1964.  
אגרות חיים נחמן ביאליק, תל-אביב, 1937.  
תולדות הספרות העברית החדשה, תל-אביב, 1954.
- לימשיץ א.מ.,  
כתבים, ירושלים, 1947-1949.
- מיזל נ.,  
ספר י.ל.פרץ : פרץ וסופרי דורו,  
נעתק לעברית על ידי מרדכי חלמיש, ירושלים, 1960.
- מלאכי א.ר.,  
" המליץ ועורכיו ", הדואר (1961), גל' 13-40.
- מירון ד.,  
" לרקע המבוכה בספרות העברית בראשית המאה ה-20 ",  
ספר היובל לשמעון הלקן, ירושלים (1975) עמ' 419-487.
- סובלסקי י.,  
" בקרת על השלוח שנה א ", האשכול א (1898) עמ' 231-242.
- סימון א.; אליהו י.,  
אחד העם האיש פועלו ותורתו, ירושלים, 1955.
- סלוצקי י.,  
העתונות היהודית רוסית במאה ה-19, ירושלים, 1970.
- פוגל ד.,  
" לשון וסגנון בספרותנו החדשה ", הדואר (1972) עמ' 149-150.

פרגראפיק י.,  
"יוסף קלוזנר כעורך השלוח", בצרון לט (1958) עמ' 124-130

קלוזנר ע.ב.,  
"מאה שנה לעתונות העברית בגרמניה",  
יד לקורא ד (1956-1957), חוברת 3-4, עמ' 89-94.

פדרבוש ש.,  
הוכחת ישראל במערב אירופה, כרך ג, תל-אביב, 1963.

פייכמן י.,  
"אגרות פרישמן לברדיצ'בסקי", מאזנים (1938),  
עמ' 231-239, 322-331, 469-478, 554-561.

פרובסט מ.,  
"העתונות העברית בהתפתחותה הכרונולוגית",  
לוח אחיאסף יג (1923) עמ' 237-291.  
"חומר מספרי לתולדות התפתחותה של העתונות העברית  
לארצותיה, לשונותיה ולזרמיה", קרית ספר ב (1925) עמ' 212

פרידמן א.א.,  
ספר הזכרונות, תל-אביב, 1926.

פרסקי ד.,  
"אחד העם וסגנונו", הדואר (1926) עמ' 778-779.

ציטרון ש.ל.,  
"רשימות לתולדות העתונות העברית",  
העולם, כרכים ו-ח (1912-1914).

קריפמן י.,  
"עיקרי דיעותיו של אחד העם",  
התקופה כז (1928) עמ' 421-439.

קלוזנר, יוסף  
דרכי לקראת התחיה והגאולה, תל-אביב, 1945.  
הלשון העברית לשון חיה, תל-אביב, 1949.  
העברית החדשה ובעיותיה, תל-אביב, 1957.  
הסטוריה של הספרות העברית החדשה, ירושלים, 1950.  
"יובל שנים לעתון עברי", הבורק, 1953, 1. 2.  
ביאליק כעורך, "באנתולוגיה:  
ביאליק יצירתו לסוגיה גראי הבקרת, בעריכת ג.שקד,  
ירושלים, 1974, עמ' 445-451.  
לזכרו של אחד העם, 100 שנה להולדתו ו-60 שנה ליסוד השלוח  
ירושלים, 1957.

ארכיון קלוזנר, unpublished			
(אוטושיקין מ.)	127	תיק מספר	
(אחד העם)	128	"	"
(אחיאסף)	129	"	"
(ביאליק ח.ב.)	135	"	"
(הכהן, מרדכי בן הלל)	169	"	"
(טוקולוב נ.)	185	"	"
(קלצקין י.)	194	"	"
(קפלן א.)	197	"	"
(כ"ץ, בן-ציון)	357	"	"
(חומר שהוגש לעיונו של ביאליק כעורך מדור הספרות היפה בהשלוח)	851	"	"

קלוזנר, ישראל  
"המשבר בספרות העברית בשנות המהפכה הראשונה ברוסיה",  
העבר כב (1977) עמ' 24-34.

קלרונר-בר, עליזה

" על השפעתו של אחד העם על ח.נ. גייליק ", עמ' 315-336,  
מאסף בעריכת הלל ברזל, תל-אביב, 1975.

קרוא ב..

" יובלו של השלוח ", מעריב, 19.9.1966.

קרסל ג..

" סערת הצעירים בהשלוח ", גליונות כו (1951-1952) עמ' 359-363.  
" הצפירה, מאה שנה לראשית הופעתו ", ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1962.  
" מאה שנה לעתונות העברית ברוסיה ", מאזנים יג (1941) עמ' 196.  
" השחר, מאה שנה לראשית הופעתו ", Jewish Book Annual  
New York כרך 27 (1969) עמ' 100-105.  
" כיצד עשו עתון לפני 100 שנה ",  
" ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1961, עמ' 377.  
" עורכי העתון העברי הראשון ",  
" ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1957, עמ' 33.  
" שלבים בעתונות העברית ",  
" ספר השנה של העתונאים, 1956, עמ' 175.

קשת י..

מיכה יוסף ברדיצ'בסקי חייו ומועלו, ירושלים, 1958.

ריבולוב מ..

" אחד העם ואמנות העריכה ", הדואר (1926) עמ' 776-777.

ריבלין א..

אחד העם ומתנגדיו והשקפותיהם על הספרות העברית בדורם,  
תל-אביב, 1955.  
פולמוס בשירה, תל-אביב, 1966.

רונסטל י.ל..

תולדות חברת מדעי ההשכלה בישראל בארץ רוסיה,  
פיטרסבורג, 1885-1890.

עאבן א..

הספרות העברית החדשה לזרמיה, תל-אביב, 1967.

שה-לבן י..

" המהפכות היהודית ברוסיה בראשית המאה ה-20 ובטויה  
בספרות העברית ", העבר כב (1977) עמ' 35-45.

שוחטמן ב..

" אודסה ", בספר: ערים ואמהות בישראל, בעריכת י.ל. פישמן,  
עמ' 58-98, ירושלים, 1948.  
" אגרות מארכיון אחד העם ", העבר ג (1955) עמ' 143-151.  
" פרקים מתולדות ספרותינו העתית ",  
העבר ז (1956) עמ' 112-132.  
" השלוח, חמשים שנה לראשית הופעתו ",  
גליונות כו (1947-1948) עמ' 101-107.

שפירא ח.ב..

" בין תקופה לתקופה ", (על השחר), גליונות ח (1939);  
עמ' 40-48.

עקד ג..

הסיפורת העברית 1880-1970, כרך א, תל-אביב, 1977.